	1
1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE EASTERN DIVISION
3	
4	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
5	Plaintiff,
6	vs. NO. 19-CR-10040
7	JEFFREY W. YOUNG, JR.,
8	Defendant.
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	TRANSCRIPT OF THE JURY TRIAL
14	BEFORE THE HONORABLE JOHN T. FOWLKES
15	AFTERNOON SESSION
16	
17	
18	THURSDAY
19	MARCH 31, 2023
20	
21	
22	TINA DuBOSE GIBSON, RPR
23	OFFICIAL REPORTER FOURTH FLOOR FEDERAL BUILDING
24	MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE 38103
25	
	UNREDACTED TRANSCRIPT

2 APPEARANCES 1 2 3 Appearing on behalf of the Government: 4 KATHERINE PAYERLE ANDREW PENNEBAKER 5 United States Department of Justice Fraud Section 6 1400 New York Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20530 7 (202) 341-4227 katherine.payerle@usdoj.gov andrew.pennebaker@usdoj.gov 8 9 Appearing on behalf of the Defendant: 10 CLAIBORNE H. FERGUSON 11 RAMON DAMAS The Claiborne Ferguson Law Firm, PA 12 294 Washington Avenue Memphis, Tennessee 38103 13 (901) 529-6400 claiborne@midsouthcriminaldefense.com 14 ramon@midsouthcriminaldefense.com 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

WITNESS INDEX PAGE **WITNESSES:** TRICIA AULTMAN, M.D. CONTINUED DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. PAYERLE. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. FERGUSON..... REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. PAYERLE..... 79 JEFFREY W. YOUNG, JR. DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. FERGUSON...... 95

5 1 THURSDAY 2 MARCH 31, 2023 3 4 5 THE COURT: Okay. Before we bring in the jury, 6 let me turn to Mr. Ferguson. What's the situation? 7 MR. FERGUSON: Your Honor, I have spoken to 8 Mr. Young over the break. We discussed our plan on how to 9 proceed after the Government rests, and we will be putting on 10 no proof. 11 THE COURT: No proof? 12 MR. FERGUSON: That is correct. 13 THE COURT: Okay. 14 MR. FERGUSON: Including Mr. Young. 15 THE COURT: I understand. And we'll put this 16 colloquy on the record after we finish with the Government's 17 witness. 18 MR. FERGUSON: Yes, Your Honor. 19 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. 20 We need the witness. 21 MS. PAYERLE: Yes, sir. 22 THE COURT: Dr. Aultman hanging out in the hall, 23 huh? How do you spell that? 24 MS. PAYERLE: I did it, again, didn't I? 25 THE WITNESS: A-U-L-T-M-A-N.

THE COURT: Thank you. Bring in the jury, please. (Jury in at 1:30 p.m.) THE COURT: Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, we're ready to proceed at this time. I hope you enjoyed lunch. I'm going to turn it back over to the Government to continue direct.

EXAMINATION OF TRICIA AULTMAN, M.D.

7

1 CONTINUED DIRECT EXAMINATION

2 BY MS. PAYERLE:

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Okay. Welcome back. Dr. Aultman, good afternoon.

 Okay. Just before the break, we were talking about the concept of continuity of care and the importance of making an individual determination for the client -- or to the patient,
 - A. Yes, ma'am.

pardon me; is that right?

- Q. Okay. At this time, I'd like to introduce, or, actually, just put up for the jury Exhibit 21.
- Dr. Aultman, Exhibit 21, which is already admitted, will appear on your screen in front of you momentarily. Now, is this a patient record for Hope Rogers, which you have reviewed in connection with this case?
- A. Yes, ma'am.
- MS. PAYERLE: Excuse me. Could we please go to page 74 of this document.
- 18 BY MS. PAYERLE:
 - Q. All right. Dr. Aultman, could you orient the jury to what -- are you going to be testifying about a few, not very many, but just a few of these documents that look like this?
 - A. Yes, ma'am.
 - Q. All right. Could you orient the jury to what kind of a document this is within the patient file.
 - A. So in this practice's medical records, all of the new

EXAMINATION OF TRICIA AULTMAN, M.D.

patient visits were in pink, which was actually nice. It was easier for me to scroll to find the first visit because there was a lot of pages of a lot of files.

So you see here, it has a patient name and demographics on top and then their chief complaint, which is, you know, why are you here, kind of thing. And then after that is review of systems. And a review of systems is when a doctor goes through and is trying to ask you if there is anything else wrong, like starting really head to toe, like, headaches, visual changes, blurry vision, and then your ears. Do you have allergies, runny nose, ear infections, sore throat, thyroid problems?

So you kind of go head to toe and then you can see they circled the sinus there. And then it looks like they're going through some medical history there and listing her allergies. There's a place to document her shots, and then there's a second page usually to the initial patient visit.

MS. PAYERLE: Let's go ahead and flip to the next page. There we go.

THE WITNESS: So on the top, the intake tech or nurse or office staff has put in their active medications right there. Their surgical history, medical history, personal history, and then you can see there, there's a small place -- can I point on this? Can I write on it?

BY MS. PAYERLE:

EXAMINATION OF TRICIA AULTMAN, M.D.

Q. You might -- no --

MS. PAYERLE: Can she --

BY MS. PAYERLE:

- Q. Oh, great. You can use your finger.
- A. So right here where, I guess, circle it. That is where Mr. Young would document his exam. I think that word is exam from looking at enough of the records, and then you can see also there's a typed area where you can write part of the physical exam with the vital signs.
 - Q. And then --

THE COURT: Could you mark that again, please.

THE WITNESS: I have to press on?

MS. PAYERLE: Yes, maybe on the right there.

THE WITNESS: The pencil didn't work.

THE COURT: It's not working; usually you can.

MS. PAYERLE: Oh, there it goes.

THE COURT: Oh, there we go.

where Mr. Young starts to document his exam. And a physician or a nurse practitioner's exam is basically a bunch of abbreviations, which makes sense to me, but probably not anyone else. So the first word there "test", and it says CTA, which means clear to auscultation. The heart exam, right there. The next one is RRR, which means regular rate rhythm. The next one is abdomen, soft and not tender, and

extremities over here. It says the typical wording is no clubbing, cyanosis, or edema. And then the neurologic exam, he writes is grossly -- I don't know if that's normal. I'm not sure what that word is.

BY MS. PAYERLE:

- Q. Okay. Before getting into more specifics, I think I just want to address one thing you said, which is, there were, in cases, a lot of pages in these records; is that right?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Did that correspond -- I mean, did you see within those pages that this sort of meant that he was doing extremely thorough, careful, detailed work?
- A. No. There was a lot of pages, but not a lot of information.
- Q. Okay. And the information that was there, would you say it was mostly -- well, first of all, you know, how is his handwriting?
- A. It's difficult to read. I mean, I'm a doctor. I'm pretty good at that. We used to all, you know, have handwritten charts, and I had a partner that was horrific, but it is still difficult for me to read even kind of knowing what I'm looking for.
- Q. And setting aside just issues of handwriting or clarity in terms of organization, I want to focus on just the

substance of what you could understand. Was it -- did it always, like, make sense from a medical perspective?

- A. You know, most of the time it didn't make sense, and I spent a lot of time in the records, and they're scanned in kind of reverse chronological order. So the first step was going through and trying to find the first visit and then trying to figure out what, you know, happened in that visit. And sometimes that meant I had to go through way back in the chart and look at the prescription monitoring program, which is like a printout of what patients -- what the medicines that were prescribed that day from a controlled substance standpoint.
- Q. And why did you have to -- why did you have to look at the prescription monitoring sheet to figure out what he had prescribed? Wasn't it just in his notes?
- A. It wasn't always in the notes. And this one, for example, it is, and I can read it, but it wasn't always in the note, and it wasn't always readable. And then the urine drug screens and other thing were also scanned in, in a different area of the chart. So there was just a lot of scrolling and back and forth. It was very time-consuming.
- Q. And I want to get back to just kind of setting aside just the mechanical kind of handwriting and organization issues. In terms of the substance of the charts, can you talk to the jury a little bit more about the effort to just,

like, figure out what he was doing?

- A. It's very difficult to figure out and to make sense of kind of the train of thought. So, for example, in this chart, he gives the impression that she has carpal tunnel syndrome, lower back pain, anxiety, endometriosis, ulcerative colitis, and inflammatory bowel disease. But if you go back to the history on the previous page, like, there's no talking about any of that other than kind of a list of previous problems. None of that's, you know, discussed. There's no questions, like, how long have you had it, who diagnosed it, you know, where were you tested? So it's very scant in terms of telling anything about how he got to the impression and plan.
- Q. And, in fact, talking specifically about Ms. Rogers, you know, which hand does she have carpal tunnel syndrome in allegedly?
 - A. It looks like the right to me, the R right here.
- Q. And did you find anything else in the file that would call into question this diagnosis?
- A. Eventually, he gets -- well, he never does a physical exam or documents a test for carpal tunnel, which is easy.

 You just bend the person's hand back and you kind of tap right there, and if they have carpal tunnel, it hurts. But he does get kind of an electro kind of diagnostic test called an EMG, a muscle test. And it was actually negative, and she

didn't have carpal tunnel syndrome.

- Q. All right. And let's talk about ulcerative colitis. That's in there. Did you see anything in the record to suggest anything about that, that she allegedly has?
- A. He never documented anything about it other than its existence according to whatever history was taken here. But when I reviewed her ob-gyn records and stuff that were in his chart, I believe that she had had a colonoscopy. It was normal, so she didn't have ulcerative colitis.
 - Q. So she did haven't that either?
 - A. No.

- Q. And what about ulcerative colitis and irritable bowel syndrome, talk about the interaction of those two.
- A. So ulcer- -- irritable bowel syndrome can be just abdominal pain with either constipation or diarrhea.

 Ulcerative colitis is a much more serious illness in terms of the need for medication. So it may be that she had a lot of abdominal pain with diarrhea and then someone said, oh, you must have colitis, but she really didn't.
- Q. She didn't. Okay. Is it normal to have irritable bowel syndrome and ulcerative colitis at the same time?
- A. No, you would -- you would just -- if you have ulcerative colitis, you would not say that she had irritable bowel syndrome.
 - Q. Okay. And under -- right under that CTS, is that LBP?

EXAMINATION OF TRICIA AULTMAN, M.D.

1 A. Yes, ma'am.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. And what is that an abbreviation for?
- A. Lower back pain.
- Q. Okay. What does it say next to lower back pain?
- A. In parentheses, broken tailbone.
- Q. And do -- I think we had a little information about how long ago that was in the chart. Do you remember what that was?
- A. It was on the previous page, and I believe it was pain 6 out of 10 that had been going on for quite a while.
 - Q. Okay. And about how long --
 - A. Two-and-a-half months, if you see right there.
 - Q. There we go. So is that normal?
- A. Probably not. Usually, tailbone stuff heals up pretty good, especially in a young, active 32-year-old person.
 - Q. So if somebody presented --
- MS. PAYERLE: Let's go back down.
- 18 BY MS. PAYERLE:
 - Q. So if somebody presented with a broken tailbone complaint of lower back pain after two-and-a-half months, if your goal is to get to a diagnosis and help the patient, what would you do?
 - A. Well, I think -- I think lower back is a different place than your tailbone anyway. So I think you have to clarify, like, where you're actually hurting. He did

document a normal neurological exam, but really, it starts with the history, right? Like, there's no history of, like -- like, I don't know how he got from broken tailbone to lower back pain because those are two different places.

- Q. Okay. And then the last one there is -- up here, what's that word?
 - A. That's endometriosis.
- Q. Okay. And did you see any -- well, first of all, what is endometriosis?
- A. So endometriosis is anytime you have the growth of uterine tissue outside the uterus.
- Q. Did you see anything in her chart that would call that diagnosis into question?
- A. Usually, people with endometriosis have a difficult time getting pregnant, and she was pregnant, eventually, in the course of her time here in the clinic.
- Q. Okay. So would any of these diagnoses -- first of all, so when you were talking about having a hard time making sense of many of his charts, is this the kind of thing that you're talking about?
- A. Exactly. There was sort of no investigation. Then all of a sudden, there was a diagnosis listed under the impression.
- Q. Okay. And were there times when the impressions were contradictory to each other, contradictory to other things in

the record, didn't make sense in the context of the patient, things like that?

- A. Yeah, they would just kind of show up or be very vague, like, lower back pain really isn't a diagnosis. It's more of a complaint, right? You need to know why do they have lower back pain.
- Q. And is that kind of what you were testifying about earlier; it could be cancer, or it could be kidney stones?
 - A. Exactly.

- Q. All right. All right. So now we've got these impressions or these potential diagnoses. Underneath the potential diagnoses for Hope Rogers, what was Mr. Young's plan that he wrote down?
- A. So in line with, I guess, a normal, healthy physical exam kind of plan, he orders labs, which is, number one, a blood count, a CMP, which is like a metabolic panel, a kidney function and stuff, a lipid panel. You could argue, probably in her age, is not indicated because she's child-bearing age, and you're not going to treat her anyway. And a thyroid panel, which is definitely indicated in someone her age.
 - Q. Okay. So that's the panel at the top?
- A. Yeah, that's the number one plan, and that's like a laboratory panel.
- Q. And then what's the second thing he said he was going to do?

- A. Number two, it says, DC, which means discontinue Tylenol 3, which is Tylenol with codeine.
 - Q. And is codeine -- and what is codeine?
- A. Codeine is a very mild opioid. It's often a first line choice for acute pain.
- Q. But when you say mild, in MMEs, do you know if it's more or less potent than morphine?
 - A. I believe codeine is less potent than morphine.
 - Q. So it would have an MME of something less than one?
 - A. Yes, ma'am.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Okay. And what does he do in number 3?
- A. In number 3, he -- it says, arrow up, increase

 Klonopin and then it's one milligram TID. TID means three

 times a day.
 - Q. And could you tell the jury, you know, sort of what kind of a dose of Klonopin is that? Is that an introductory, medium, high dose?
 - A. That's at least a medium-ish dose, maybe higher. And there's no indication, you know, why he increased the dose. Now, it does say above here that she was taking it three times a day, but she was only getting 60 at a time, and I think he increased it so that she would have it 90.
 - Q. Okay. But even that note about three times a day is also contradictory?
 - A. Right.

- Q. Not clear what she was getting?
- A. No. It's not clear. You would have to look at the PMP and compare it to see what she actually had before.
- Q. All right. And what's the next line there? What did he give her?
- A. Number 4 is HCD, which is an abbreviation for hydrocodone, 7.5 milligrams, and TID is three times a day.
 - Q. So is that a low, medium, high dose of hydrocodone?
- A. It's not the lowest dose. It's not medium, but low medium. How is that?
- Q. Okay. So in this case, he discontinued a very low level opioid, codeine, and he began hydrocodone, and he increased Klonopin. Is that the drug scenario?
- A. Yes, ma'am. So, really, with no clear reason that I can understand, he's increased her opioid dose on the first visit and increased the benzodiazepine dose as well.
- Q. So would it be the case -- maybe this is obvious. But did Mr. Young in this case, with Hope Rogers, just sort of do what the last doctor was doing?
- A. He actually did a little more. Yeah. He just kind of picked up. He -- there's no evidence he did his own investigation, and Klonopin and benzodiazepines aren't the first choice of medicine for anxiety anyway.
- Q. Did he actually discontinue what the last doctor was doing, that codeine?

- A. He did. He stopped the Tylenol 3, and he started something stronger.
- Q. Right. He started her on hydrocodone for the first time?
 - A. Yes, ma'am.

- Q. Okay. And let's move down -- oh, I want to ask you one other thing. If a patient comes in with a bunch of complaints like this that are contradictory, don't make sense, things like that, could that, itself, be a symptom that a doctor such take into account in formulating a diagnosis?
- A. Yes, sometimes if things don't make sense, it kind of always raises a red flag that maybe they are just abusing the medicine, and they're coming up with kind of common complaints. There are certain things certain complaints that people will say that they have that they think will yield them the controlled substance that they want.
- Q. And what about -- is there anything about Ms. Rogers' demographics that would create even a higher alert?
- A. Right. So women are more likely to abuse prescription drugs than men, and young people more likely than old. So she's, like, right in the demographic where you have to be very careful.
- Q. Let's take a look at page 59 of this same exhibit.

 All right. What are we looking at, at page 59? First of

- all, what kind of a document is this?
 - A. So this is a follow-up note from February 11th for the same patient.
 - Q. And what is that -- so what's the follow-up note, I quess?
 - A. This means it's not the history and physical. It's just a note that's coming in for a follow-up of the same kind of problems you already presented with.
 - Q. And what does -- what shows up here in the nurse's note, what is that?
 - A. So the chief complaint is: Patient CO, complained of, wrist pain in right arm, needs a shot, patient just found out she is pregnant.
 - Q. All right. So, actually, I do want to go back briefly to -- well, no, we'll just keep on rolling. All right. This is in February of 2015. What is the patient on here?
 - A. So at some point, already, he's gone from hydrocodone 7.5 milligrams to Percocet 7.5 milligrams.
 - Q. And is that more potent? Is that another increase, I quess?
 - A. Yes, ma'am, oxycodone is 1.5 times as strong as hydrocodone.
 - Q. And then what do we see kind of down here in this chart? Maybe we can pull that up.
 - A. Yeah, it's pretty small. But there's a line -- the

typed line at the top says physical exam and the check mark means examined and normal. So basically what he's indicated is that he's examined this patient in entirety, her eyes, ears, throat, neck, a breast exam, a pelvic exam, the whole thing, and it's all normal.

- Q. Based on what you know about this patient, is that likely?
- A. No, number one, she's pregnant, right? And so even at early pregnancy, there would be changes you would recognize on a pelvic exam.
- Q. If a patient were pregnant and taking Percocet, in the ordinary course of professional practice, what would you do?
- A. So opioids are not -- are not a drug of choice in pregnancy in any way. They're supposed to be used only if absolutely necessary. And so the standard of care, if someone is on opioids, is to switch them to either methadone or Suboxone, and then there's a couple of reasons for that. It's safer for the mom, and it's safer for the baby. And babies, when they're born to a mom that's on opioids, have neonatal abstinence syndrome, which is basically withdrawal in the newborn. And if you switch them to methadone or Suboxone, there's less severe withdrawal for the baby as well.
 - Q. And is Suboxone often used to treat addiction?
 - A. It is.

- Q. Is it also known as buprenorphine?
- A. Suboxone has buprenorphine with Narcan in it, naloxone, yes, ma'am.
- Q. Okay. So let's take a look at -- I'm going to see if I can grab one of these exhibits here.

I'd like to take a look at Exhibit 22.

MS. PAYERLE: And let's page down one more, one more, one more, one more, and one more. Okay. Stop there. Give me a second. Let's go down, I'm sorry, one more. And one more. One more. One more. There we go. That's page 17.

BY MS. PAYERLE:

- Q. Let's take a look at page 17 of this Exhibit 22. What do we see here? We see -- what is this prescription for, for Hope Rogers dated March 5, 2015?
- A. So it's for Percocet, which is basically oxycodone with Tylenol, 7.5 milligrams of oxycodone with 325 milligrams of Tylenol, quantity of 90. And then on the bottom, it says SIG and one by mouth three times a day.
- Q. Did you see anything at all in Ms. Rogers' chart that would indicate that this prescription for Percocet or oxycodone was written within the ordinary course of professional practice for a legitimate medical purpose?
- A. No, and she was pregnant, and it would be contraindicated, to be honest.
 - Q. In fact -- explain to the jury what you mean when you

say indicated and contraindicated?

- A. So indicated means there's a medical reason to prescribe something. And contraindicated means that there's not a medical reason to prescribe something. Opioids fall into a class, and they rate pregnancy drugs in a certain class, and they're not in a class that you should prescribe unless you really, really, really have a good reason.
- Q. All right. Let's take a look -- okay. Now, let's note the date of this prescription is March 5, 2015, and how many days' supply is this?
- A. So if you're taking it three times a day and it's 90 pills, it's 30 days.
- Q. So for March 5, 2015, she has a 30-day supply. Let's take a look at page 9 of the same exhibit. And what do we have here?
- A. This is a prescription for hydrocodone or Lortab,

 7.5 milligrams with 325 milligrams of Tylenol to take three
 times a day, quantity of 90. And it was written only about

 20 days or a couple of weeks after the previous prescription.

 So now she's on two opioids during pregnancy, and if she's
 taking them at the same time, it's a lot of Tylenol as well.
- Q. And explain to the jury what you mean by the Tylenol problem.
- A. I mean, Tylenol is a pregnancy Class B, so it's probably okay, but it's -- you still have to be so careful in

pregnancy because we can't do good studies on pregnant women, right? It's not ethical. So you can't give some pregnant woman a drug and another pregnant woman not and see what happens. So the studies are all information we gain from what people report after they've had the baby which, of course, is not reliable all the time.

MS. PAYERLE: All right. I've located the hard copy of this. So I think it will be a little easier. Let's move down one more page. Well, I thought I had it.

 $\label{eq:limit} \mbox{All right.} \ \mbox{I'm just going to use the Elmo.}$ There we go.

BY MS. PAYERLE:

- Q. All right. Let's take a look at these prescriptions dated -- what's the date; do you see?
 - A. April 23rd.
- Q. All right. So what -- what did Mr. Young prescribe to Hope Rogers on April 23, 2015?
- A. The top prescription is for Lortab 7.5, 325, and now instead of 90, it's 120. So it's an increase in dose. And then the bottom prescription is Xanax or alprazolam,

 1 milligram three times a day, quantity of 90. And then the Phenergan is a medicine for nausea, but it's not a controlled substance. And the very bottom is ProAir, which is an inhaler for asthma.
 - Q. All right. So for this -- actually, I don't remember

if I asked you, Doctor, for the March 25th prescription that we just saw, was that prescription for hydrocodone within the course of professional practice for a legitimate medical purpose?

- A. No, ma'am, especially because she was pregnant.
- Q. And how about this one for Lortab?
- A. Absolutely not. Now he's increasing it. He's putting both the patient at risk increase for overdose. He's putting the child at risk for worsening neonatal abstinence syndrome, which is kind of ugly, to be honest.
- Q. Well, go ahead and describe for the jury what is neonatal abstinence syndrome look like?
- A. When a baby is born with neonatal abstinence, the first, maybe day or two, may be okay and they are monitoring it, and then they have to move it to the special nursery. And they can have seizures, tremors, they're irritable, they don't eat well, they don't sleep well, they're difficult to feed, and developmentally, they're usually behind the other babies for at least a year, and then they tend to catch up. But it's not a pretty thing and results in long hospital stays for the babies.
 - Q. What about the Xanax?
- A. Same. So benzodiazepines are actually Class D in pregnancy, which is -- there's absolutely no indication to prescribe a benzodiazepine in the first trimester of

pregnancy for any reason ever. There have been studies that show that the babies can have heart defects, and they can also have cleft palate and other kind of facial defects. And so there really is no indication of prescribed benzodiazepines in the first trimester of pregnancy. The first trimester being when all the organs are being formed.

Q. All right.

MS. PAYERLE: Let's take a look at -- go back to Exhibit 21. And that means, sorry, we have to switch back. Exhibit 21 at page 98.

MS. SILVERBERG: Page 98?

MS. PAYERLE: 98.

BY MS. PAYERLE:

Q. We were just talking about a prescription for -- where he increased Lortab and added Xanax on April 23, 2015, and I apologize. We're just going to move on to the next prescription.

MS. PAYERLE: We can take that down. All right. Let's go back to this. And can we go back. I'm sorry. I'm going to have to be moving back and forth.

BY MS. PAYERLE:

- Q. All right. Let's go to the next prescription in May. What is this on May 20, 2015?
- A. It's Lortab 7.5 to take four times a day, and the lower one is Xanax, 1 milligram for three times a day.

- Q. All right. And, again, Dr. Aultman, were these prescriptions, either one of them, written in the ordinary course of professional practice for a legitimate medical purpose?
- A. No, and they were dangerous for the patient and the baby.
 - Q. For the same reasons we discussed already?
 - A. Yes, ma'am.
- Q. Okay. And these were in May. Here we go. These were in May of 2015; is that right?
- 11 A. Yes, ma'am.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

17

18

19

20

21

22

- MS. PAYERLE: All right. Now let's take a look, sorry. We can go back to 419 to Exhibit 21 and take a look at page 118.
- 15 THE WITNESS: Okay.
- 16 BY MS. PAYERLE:
 - Q. All right. Are you familiar with this kind of document in the patient record?
 - A. Yes, ma'am.
 - Q. And is this document a toxicology report for Hope Rogers?
 - A. Yes, ma'am.
- Q. Tell the jury just about this kind of document, how it would figure into your analysis.
 - A. Right. So at the top, this is kind of demographic

information: her name, her date of birth, and it's urine.

And then the important part to look at is right there, the medications. So that's the medications that you're supposed to see in her urine. And then they just — the validity, this is to make sure that someone is not bringing fake urine.

And then the results are at the bottom.

- Q. What were the results of Hope Rogers' drug screen on April 29, 2015, which was, I guess, what, like, the week before the -- or a couple of weeks before the last prescription was written?
- A. Yes, ma'am. So she was supposed to be on alprazolam and hydrocodone, and you can see that she does have hydrocodone in her system, which is appropriate.

 Hydromorphone is what hydrocodone is metabolized to, so that is appropriate as well. But she also has oxycodone in her system, and she's not prescribed that.
 - Q. How much oxycodone does she have in her system?
 - A. It's -- it lists as very high.
- Q. And is that a red flag itself?
- A. It is a red flag that she's taking -- she's getting it from somewhere. She doesn't have a prescription and it's a lot, and she's pregnant.
- Q. Is there another reason that there might be kind of off the charts amounts of a drug in somebody's system?
 - A. Yes. Sometimes if they're trying to fake a drug

screen, if they might save one pill or keep one back and then they spike their urine with it. Sometimes you can tell by if they check the metabolites. Like, if there was oxycodone present but then there was no oxymorphone, that might be an indication that it wasn't real.

- Q. And we might see an example sort of specifically there. Here, where do you see that it's, like, a lot, sort of a lot of oxycodone? How can you tell?
- A. So the upper limit of normal on this is 500, and it says greater than 500. So the range here is 20 to 500. So that's a lot.

MS. PAYERLE: All right. Let's go back to the Elmo. And let me get rid of these little marks.

BY MS. PAYERLE:

- Q. And what are we looking at here at Exhibit 22?
- A. This is a prescription for hydrocodone 7.5 with 325 milligrams of Tylenol. It says at the bottom SIG 1 PO QID, which is four times a day.
- Q. And is that an increase in terms of potency or quantity since the May 20th prescription?
 - A. I think it was. I think it was 90 to 120.
- Q. Or was it -- let's see. I want to make sure we got that right. We may not.
- A. It was increased from her initial prescription, I know that. It was the same.

- Q. It was the same there? So that wasn't an increase. All right. And then let's go back to the trial directory. The patient chart, Exhibit 21, and look at Exhibit 113, or sorry, page 113 of that exhibit. And what do we see here?
- A. So this is another urine drug screen, and she is supposed to be on Xanax and hydrocodone. And you can see here that her hydrocodone level is very, very high, and the metabolite is hydromorphone, which is also really, really high.
 - Q. And does that mean anything in particular to you?
- A. Yeah, it's concerning that she's taking more than prescribed and she's pregnant, and it's dangerous for her and the child.
 - Q. And do you see a stamp there in the middle?
- A. It says, we'll discuss these at your next office visit.
 - Q. Did you come to recognize that signature?
 - A. Yes.

- 19 Q. Whose is that?
 - A. That is Jeffrey Young.
 - Q. All right. Let's take a look then at -- and so I think the prescription we just saw written on June 19, 2015, so after this drug screen came back, was that prescription written within the ordinary course of professional practice for a legitimate medical purpose?

- A. No. And the appropriate thing to do would be to put her on Suboxone or methadone or refer her to someone that would because she's got a problem.
 - Q. So at this point, you're convinced?
 - A. Absolutely.

- Q. And how long ago in our conversation were you convinced?
- A. From the -- I mean, I've reviewed these a lot and in a pregnant person, there's just -- it's absolutely inexcusable to prescribe these kinds of medicines.
- Q. And is this -- when I ask usual course of professional practice for a legitimate medical purpose in Hope Rogers' case, I mean, that's legal jargon. Can I ask you, is it even close?
- A. It's really not. And he's really harming this person, right? Because she is at risk if she's on opioids for a preterm delivery, for a stillbirth, for a low birth weight baby, and for overdose. And the baby is at risk for, you know, dying in utero and such. And so it's not just bad medicine, it's harmful. He's really hurting these people and could have had a very bad outcome.
- Q. Let's take a look now at what we have on the Elmo.

 And is this -- do we have here what -- what is this

 prescription on what date?
 - A. This is a prescription for Percocet 7.5 with 325 of

Tylenol written on July 17.

- Q. And is this an increase from the last one?
- A. It's an increase from hydrocodone, yes, ma'am.
- Q. Okay. And is this prescription, given the context that we've been discussing, was this written in the ordinary course of professional practice for a legitimate medical purpose?
 - A. Absolutely not.
- Q. All right. Let's take a look at what happens to Ms. Rogers post pregnancy. And take a look back at the patient chart at page -- let's see, Exhibit 21 at page 108.

All right. Is this after Ms. Rogers delivers her baby?

- A. It looks like it was October, so, yes.
- Q. All right. And what do we see here on this toxicology scene?
 - A. So at this time, she's supposed to be taking alprazolam and Percocet, which is oxycodone with acetaminophen, and it looks like the Xanax was detected. So she's taking it appropriately although the concentration is very high. And she's taking the oxycodone. You can see there. So she's taking that although, again, the concentration is rather high of the oxycodone. But she also has hydrocodone in her -- she has hydrocodone in her system, which she's not supposed to be taking, right? So it

shouldn't be there.

But then the curious thing about the Xanax or the alprazolam is that the Xanax is positive, but the metabolite is negative, right? And so there's no way that that can happen if it's a real true sample, right? Because your body is always going to be metabolizing it. So with the Xanax, anyway, it looks like she probably spiked her urine with it and that's why it's positive for Xanax, but it doesn't have the metabolite that your body would naturally make. It would come out in your urine.

- Q. Okay. And I want to see if we can -- maybe we can blow up this summary of qualitative results part here. And if you could just teach the jury kind of what -- what you were seeing in terms of high concentration, no metabolites?
- A. Okay. So the Xanax she was taking, so it's positive in her urine, which is consistent with her prescription. But it, naturally in your body, alprazolam is metabolized to hydroalprazolam, hydroxyalprazolam. So if you're truly taking the Xanax, this should be positive here too. You should have metabolite in your urine, and there's none, which is indicating that she's probably spiking her urine with a pill that she's kept left over.
- Q. And, again, we have a very -- it seems like a very high level of oxycodone as well; is that right?
 - A. It's a very high level of oxycodone. If you see the

upper range of normal is 2500, and then again, the hydrocodone is present, and she's not prescribed that.

Q. Let's take a look at page 103 of the same patient record. And look at -- the date is January 17, 2016.

MS. PAYERLE: And let's blow up the bottom two boxes here. There we go. Now, let's go ahead and blow up both boxes. Thank you.

BY MS. PAYERLE:

- Q. Okay. What does this -- this particular test result says under notes that caught your attention?
- A. Right. So this one, they actually say, hey, pay attention, the drug is positive, but there's no metabolite, which is not normal. That's not consistent with how a drug would show up in your urinalysis if you put it in your mouth and it came out in your urine. So the Xanax is metabolized -- sorry, the alprazolam is metabolized to hydroxyalprazolam, and there's no metabolites. And the same with the oxycodone to the oxymorphone.
 - Q. So what does that indicate happened here?
 - A. That she was spiking her urine with medication.
- Q. Would any prescriptions written to her during this time be consistent with the ordinary course of professional practice for a legitimate medical purpose?
- A. Definitely not. She's clearly abusing, diverting, selling, doing something with her medicine, but she's not

taking it in the prescribed manner.

MS. PAYERLE: Okay. Let's pull this down.

BY MS. PAYERLE:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

25

- Q. I'm going to show you -- the jury has heard about a patient named Aaron Beaver, and so I'm going to show you his medical record. It's a 59-page document. I promise we won't go through all 59 pages.
 - A. Okay.
 - Q. I that -- do you recognize that?
- 10 A. Yes, ma'am.

MS. PAYERLE: We move to admit.

THE COURT: Okay. We'll go ahead and receive the

documents. I believe the Exhibit Number 98.

(Exhibit 98 marked and received.)

THE COURT: What is the patient's name again?

MS. PAYERLE: Aaron Beaver. B-E-A-V-E-R.

BY MS. PAYERLE:

- Q. Let's take a look at page 39 of what is now Exhibit
- 19 98. What did you see here that struck you?
- 20 A. So this is the intake visit or the new patient visit

21 for Mr. Beaver, and he's very honest. He says that he's

22 addicted to heroin, morphine, and that, you know, he's in,

23 basically, a crisis. He wants to use, and he's having

24 withdrawal symptoms.

Q. At that point, would any prescriptions of opioids,

other than addiction medication, be within the course of professional practice for a legitimate medical purpose for Aaron Beaver?

A. Absolutely not.

- Q. Let's take a look at page 30 of this patient file. And do we have, at page 30, a -- another visit by Aaron Beaver on 10/10? Oh, it looks like it was canceled?
- A. No, it looks like the 9/21 was struck through as canceled, but maybe he was there on 10/10, I think.
 - Q. Okay. The next page, sorry.
 - A. It's what it looks like.
- Q. And under Plan, did Mr. Young prescribe anything to Aaron Beaver on that date?
- A. Yes, ma'am. It looks like he gave him a shot. From what I figured out, this is a combination of steroids and anti-inflammatory medicine. And then he prescribes Dilaudid, which is a high potency opioid. It's about four times as strong as morphine, so basically, it's about 8 milligrams of morphine three times a day.
- Q. Would Aaron Beaver's back pain, under the circumstances with what -- in which he presented to Mr. Young as addicted and struggling with addiction, would this prescription be within the course of professional practice for a legitimate medical purpose?
 - A. No, it's actually just really tragic. They've just

- put in the hands of an addict a very addictive substance, and he's been clean, we think, since, you know, maybe a couple -- maybe eight months, six months, hard to know from the chart. But so you've just basically given him a ticket to go right back down the path, which is really tragic.
- Q. Let's go to page 28 of the same patient file. And this is 2 milligrams of Dilaudid; is that right?
 - A. Yes, ma'am.

- O. What's the date for 28?
- 10 A. This date is October 12, so just a couple of days
 11 later.
 - Q. And let's go to the next page. What happens here?
 - A. So at the next visit, which is just two days later, he's doubled the dose of Dilaudid and given a quantity of 15. So the patient has already used up, you know, a supply, which should have been, if it was just an acute episode, it's gone, and now he's giving him more and a higher dose.
 - Q. Is anything about this legitimate medicine?
 - A. Definitely not.

MS. PAYERLE: We can pull that down.

BY MS. PAYERLE:

Q. Okay. As we go on to the next patient, I want you to -- I just want to clarify something. We already are talking about a mouthful, the usual course of professional practice for legitimate medical purpose. When we're talking

about the usual course of professional practice here, are you talking about for this -- for the State of Tennessee, for where we are?

A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. And does it differ much from anywhere else?
- A. No, ma'am. The rules and regulations in most state medical boards are very similar.
- Q. But, you know, would it -- and I guess -- I guess there's a question of from what we've observed, would this be the usual course of professional practice anywhere?
- A. No, ma'am.
- Q. Okay. But it is also not in the State of Tennessee; is that right?
- A. Definitely not.
- Q. Okay. Let me show you what we've marked as 404. This is a 54-page document. Is this a medical file for a patient who's listed there as Katie Crowder?
- A. Yes, ma'am.

MS. PAYERLE: The Government moves to admit.

THE COURT: That will be Number 99.

(Exhibit 99 marked and received.)

- BY MS. PAYERLE:
- Q. And, Dr. Aultman, in the course of working on this case, did you learn that Katie Crowder was actually an undercover name for an officer working on an operation?

A. Yes, ma'am.

- Q. But there's a patient record for her that was recovered and sent to you?
 - A. Yes, ma'am.
- Q. All right. Let's take a look at page 9 of Exhibit 99. What is page 9?
- A. So this is a Tennessee prescription monitoring program printout, and it's what you check in the office to see if your patient is getting a prescription anywhere else. At the time, you just check in the State of Tennessee. Now you can actually check multiple states, which is really convenient. And so you can see, it's kind of reverse chronological order, but you can see there is June and then through September of 2016.
- Q. And let's go to the next page just to see where the end is. Was that June entry the first entry on her PMP?
 - A. Yes, ma'am.
- Q. And who are the -- are there any other prescribers besides Jeffrey Young listed for this person?
 - A. No, the prescribers are just him right there.
- Q. All right. Let's go back up to the front page. So who was the first person to prescribe Katie Crowder opioids of any kind in the State of Tennessee?
- A. Jeff Young on June the 6th, he gave her hydrocodone, 5 milligrams, a quantity of 60 so, like, twice a day.

- Q. So here was he just picking up what some other doctor was doing, or was he --
- A. I don't think so. I think it was -- she was opioid naive, according to our printout and according to her history.
- Q. And could you explain to the jury what opioid naive means.
 - A. That means you've never taken opioids before.
- Q. Could you explain what the impact of an opioid on an opioid naive person is.
- A. So 5 milligrams twice a day is a pretty healthy dose.

 I mean, that's definitely a good acute pain pain relief dose
 but for acute pain, you wouldn't need it for the whole month.
 - Q. All right. And so the quantity is high?
- A. So the MME for that is 10 MME a day.
 - Q. Now, do you watch some videos where you could see
 Mr. Young in action interacting with the patient known as
 Katie Crowder?
 - A. Yes, ma'am, I watched the videos.
- Q. Okay. And do you remember the -- in the sort of first video with Mr. Young, she said that she didn't fill an earlier tramadol prescription?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. All right. What's your opinion about that?
 - A. So if you lay out a plan of care for a patient and

they don't want to follow it, then you don't have any trust, right? And so that's not a good relationship from the beginning. And it would be a sign to me that they just want an opioid, that they're fishing.

- Q. In that video, she says she's gotten a hydrocodone before from a friend. Do you have any opinions about that?
- A. That's a common thing that people say, unfortunately, and I usually try and remind them, you know, that's illegal, right, to take someone else's medication. And it's also a sign that she's fishing or shopping for a specific medication.
- Q. And in the video, did you hear Mr. Young tell her, hey, you probably shouldn't just take drugs from other people?
 - A. I did not hear him say that.
- Q. Let's look at page 46 in this medical record. And is this the sort of intake form that corresponds to that date?
- A. Yes, this is the follow-up visit, and he says here, has taken hydrocodone in the past.
- Q. Does he say that she had taken it, like, from a friend?
 - A. No, he just says she's taken it.
- Q. So the chart isn't complete with respect to that bit of information?
 - A. No, it's not a complete history for sure.

- Q. And, in fact, he had information that he didn't put in the chart?
 - A. Exactly.

- Q. Does he document that it -- that he told her any risks of taking pills?
- A. It doesn't document either here or on the next page that goes with the visit that he counseled her in any way about the risk of starting opioid therapy.
 - Q. And you saw the video. Did he counsel her?
 - A. No, ma'am.
- Q. All right. But what's interesting here is in this box below.
- MS. PAYERLE: Ms. Silverberg, if you could blow that up.
- 15 BY MS. PAYERLE:
 - Q. Remind the jury, what does this line here under Normal, what does that indicate that -- that Mr. Young is saying that he did?
 - A. So this is the review of systems part that we talked about where you basically go head to toe and say, do you have blurry vision, double vision, can you see anything, do you have throat pain, neck pain, and you go through every organ system, and he clearly didn't do that on the videos.
 - Q. But he documented that he had?
 - A. He did.

- Q. Okay. If Mr. Young was practicing in the ordinary course of professional practice, what would he have done with the information that Katie Crowder was opioid naive but had taken hydrocodone from a friend and didn't fill her tramadol prescription?
- A. So sort of what would I do if I were the physician in that position?
- Q. What would be the ordinary course of professional practice?
- A. Right. So you would counsel the patient. You would talk to them and document it in the chart and say, hey, like, I think you may have a problem here, let's talk about this. It's okay if you have a problem. I can help you with that, but we need to be honest and have a trusting relationship if you want me to help you. And I definitely wouldn't prescribe opioids.
- Q. Do you remember, in this visit, when Mr. Young asked for an MRI to put in the chart, you know, just because he needs the piece of paper?
 - A. Yes, ma'am.
 - Q. Did you have any opinions about that?
- A. That's a very common thing that I see when I'm reviewing records for things that are not appropriate is they think if you just put stuff in there, if I just have an X-ray or a piece of paper that says I have an MRI, it will make it

look like I tried.

- Q. And in the video, she said the radiologist told her nothing was wrong. Does that change your -- do anything to your opinion about the appropriateness of this prescription?
- A. No. Well, I mean, it makes it worse, I guess. So we know she didn't really have back pain because she didn't really have back pain.
- Q. At the very least, the MRI doesn't demonstrate any problem?
 - A. Yes, ma'am.
- Q. And after learning the MRI didn't demonstrate any problem, did he then follow up with, hey, maybe we should get different testing to figure out what's actually wrong with you?
- A. He did not.
 - Q. Let's take a look at page 45 of this exhibit. The prescription he wrote for her, is this prescription that we're looking at within the course of professional practice for a legitimate medical purpose in the State of Tennessee?
 - A. No, ma'am, it's not.
 - Q. In the next video in July of 2016, Ms. Crowder tells him that the pain is worse at night when she lies down. Do you remember that?
 - A. Yes, ma'am.
 - Q. Do you have any opinions about that?

- A. That's kind of -- it kind of contradicts what most people have when they have low back pain. Usually, it's worse when they're moving around, and it's better with rest.
- Q. And let's say -- let's look at page 41 of this exhibit. What do you see here in the chief complaint?

MS. PAYERLE: Let's blow up this chief complaint down to current medications. Keep going, keep going, stop.

THE WITNESS: So, basically, it says, patient's here for follow-up and requesting refills, has a history of low back pain, states that the hydrocodone wears off too soon, can she try something else. And it looks like he wrote, having breakthrough pain. And it looks like he's trying to draw a pain scale, and it looks like maybe he wrote 9 or 7, 7 out of 10.

BY MS. PAYERLE:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Q. Seven, okay. And then --

MS. PAYERLE: Let's back out of that.

BY MS. PAYERLE: And do you --

MS. PAYERLE: Let's go to the next page.

BY MS. PAYERLE:

- Q. What does -- what does Mr. Young do on this visit? What does he prescribe her?
- A. So he adds a fentanyl patch at 50 micrograms.
- Q. Explain to the jury what your -- explain to the jury,
 I guess, what went through your mind when you saw that?

A. It's really actually, like, unbelievable. There's no medical indication to give a fentanyl patch at 50 micrograms or any fentanyl patch to a healthy 20- or 30-year-old that has what you think is musculoskeletal pain. Her MME, before this visit, was two Lortabs a day, right? So it was an MME of 10; 5 plus 5 is 10. The MME of a 50 microgram patch is 120.

So he has taken her from 10 to 120 milligrams of morphine and, essentially, if this young woman, who is small anyway, put this patch on, she would be dead. Like, she wouldn't be back. Like, she would just fall asleep, stop breathing, and she would die because you just cannot use fentanyl in that manner. It's not how it was meant to be used.

- Q. Dr. Aultman, were either of these prescriptions, either the fentanyl that we see here, the hydrocodone we saw earlier, or the hydrocodone that were written in this visit prescribed within the ordinary course of professional practice for a legitimate medical purpose in the State of Tennessee?
 - A. No, ma'am.
- Q. And she, I believe, goes back in August?

 MS. PAYERLE: Let's take a look at page 34.

 Sorry. All right. So let's go to 37.

25 BY MS. PAYERLE:

EXAMINATION OF TRICIA AULTMAN, M.D.

- Q. You see here that there's a documented pain range of 5 out of 10. Do you see that?
 - A. Yes, ma'am.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. And what else was written here?
- A. Looks like it says, doing better on fentanyl patch.
- Q. Again, does Mr. Young mark as though he has completely examined her, all systems?
- A. Yeah, he marks through that he's questioned all the systems, and they're negative.
 - Q. And did he do that in the video?
- A. No, ma'am.
 - Q. All right.
 - Ms. PAYERLE: Let's go to the next page. Go to the next one, sorry. There's a weird blank. Just go to the next one.
 - MS. SILVERBERG: This is it.
- MS. PAYERLE: Oh, that's it. I'm sorry. You've got it. Thank you.
- 19 BY MS. PAYERLE:
 - Q. All right. What happens here with respect to her prescriptions?
 - A. So, you know, he actually increases the fentanyl from 50 to 75. And just to give an example, the last patient I had with a 75-microgram fentanyl patch, she was, like, a 34-year-old in the hospital with cervical cancer that had

spread throughout her organs and her bowels had ruptured.

And we were trying to get her home so she could spend some time with her kids, and we didn't want her to have to keep taking medicine. But, like, that's an appropriate use of fentanyl is just a horrific, horrible cancer that is, like, killing somebody, and they need to have a little bit of time

with their family at home without being in pain.

- Q. And if he prescribed her fentanyl and hydrocodone on this visit as well, would those prescriptions be in the ordinary course of professional practice for a legitimate medical purpose in Tennessee?
- A. Absolutely not.
- Q. And, actually, let's take a look at page 36. Page 36. Sorry. Is that -- is that the prescription?
- A. Yes, ma'am.

- Q. Next, do you remember a visit in which there were two women that came to Mr. Young's office?
- A. Yes, ma'am.
- Q. And he was talking about a Halloween party?
- A. Yes, ma'am.
- Q. All right. Tell the jury your impressions of that visit.
- A. So I think, like, all the video visits, the actual medical conversation is almost nothing. Right. There's a significant portion of time discussing other things. And

it's okay to discuss other things. You know, my patients know about my kids and all kind of stuff, but you have to also remain professional, and you also have to do an appropriate history and physical, which were not done.

- Q. And let's take a look at page 26 of the patient record. Also, before I move on, though, was it -- like, is it normal for two girlfriends to show up together at a doctor's visit both looking for pain drugs?
- A. No. Seeing a husband, wife, or a couple together or parent-child is pretty normal, but friends is kind of not typical at all, and suspect.
- Q. Okay. And then did you remember the other undercover officer mentioning something about landing -- falling and landing on her lower back?
- A. Yes, ma'am.
- Q. Okay. What were your thoughts on that explanation of why she had pain?
- A. I think it's really tricky to fall and land on your lower back unless you land on something. It's just a really weird history that should have prompted further questioning, like, what do you mean, like, how do you land on your lower back, unless it's like landing on a curb or, I don't know, something.
- Q. Were the prescriptions that were written in this video within the course of professional practice for legitimate

medical purpose in the State of Tennessee?

A. No, ma'am.

Q. And that is in October of 2016 to Katie Crowder.

All right. And then also at that visit, was an undercover Kristina Norton, and she was the one we were talking about landing on her lower back?

- A. Yes, ma'am.
- Q. Okay. Were the prescriptions written to Kristina

 Norton who were written -- sorry, for legitimate medical

 purpose in the ordinary course of professional practice in

 the State of Tennessee?
- A. No, ma'am. In fact, she just said that she took some Percocet, I think, from her mom, and then that was what she was prescribed.
- Q. So was Mr. Young continuing care from another physician?
 - A. No.
- Q. During the video, she says, I've taken some tabs and sometimes I turn to smoking. What do -- what are tabs? Do you know?
 - A. I think tab usually refers to a Lortab.
- Q. Would it raise a red flag if a patient told you they took tabs?
- A. Yeah, a patient talking in kind of street lingo about medication is always concerning.

EXAMINATION OF TRICIA AULTMAN, M.D.

Q. Let's take a look at -- all right. In the next visit, you saw, I believe, Kristina Norton went back by herself.

MS. PAYERLE: Can we look at Exhibit 70? And I don't know what our number is. That's it. Yeah.

BY MS. PAYERLE:

- Q. Okay. What are looking at here?
- A. This is -- appears to be a copy of -- let's see, right here, an X-ray of her lumbar spine, which is the very low part of your back, and it says two or three views, which is the common way that it's done. And then the history is back pain, and then this is kind of the radiologist stuff, so to speak. And then this is -- the impression is basically the result, and it says, no acute osseous, which means bony findings.
- Q. What does that mean?
 - A. It, basically, is a normal X-ray. She was a little constipated right here. That's all.
 - Q. And was there anything on that X-ray that would suggest that a prescription for oxycodone 10 milligrams would be within the course of professional practice for a legitimate medical purpose?
 - A. Absolutely not.

MS. PAYERLE: Let's take a look at page 71. Or sorry, Exhibit 71. Let's go to the next page. There it is. BY MS. PAYERLE:

UNREDACTED TRANSCRIPT

- Q. Okay. At the top of the screen there, this is a receipt. Do you see where there was an oxycodone

 10 milligrams prescription written by Jeff Young to Kristina

 Norton?
 - A. Yes, ma'am.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Okay. So is that your opinion about this prescription that it was not appropriate?
 - A. Yes, ma'am.

MS. PAYERLE: All right. We have seen -- actually, let me -- let me just do -- I'm going to do one more, Judge, and I promise it's the last one.

- 12 BY MS. PAYERLE:
 - Q. I'm going to show you a document that we've marked 413. And it is 61 pages. And it's a patient record for a patient named Daphne Montoya.
 - A. Okay.
 - Q. And are you familiar with this document?
 - A. Yes.

MS. PAYERLE: Move to admit.

THE COURT: 100.

(Exhibit 100 marked and received.)

- BY MS. PAYERLE:
- Q. Let's take a look at page 53 of Exhibit 100. In Daphne Montoya's file, did you find this document?
 - A. Yes, ma'am.

- Q. All right. Explain to the jury -- I mean, you can read it if you want, but explain to the jury if you want to summarize what was happening here?
- A. Okay. So the telephone notes that they took at various times were usually on a yellow piece of paper. They kind of looked like this. And so there was a problem with it says, Jeff's Schedule II narcotics. And if you just read through, it says, the patient here, Daphne Joyner Montoya, filled oxycodone 10 four times a day, quantity of 120, and she paid cash under her name Daphne Joyner. But then Daphne Montoya filled oxycodone, the same basic prescription, and she was using her insurance. So, basically, the person is using maiden/married name, paying one with cash, using her insurance for the other one to get double the quantity of medicine.
- Q. And would that -- were both of those written by Jeff Young?
 - A. Yes, ma'am.
- Q. So one in one name, Daphne Joyner, and the other was written in the other name, Daphne Montoya?
 - A. Yes, ma'am.
- Q. Is there any red flags here?
- A. It's completely inappropriate. I don't know how else to say it, it's wrong. It's not right. It's putting a patient in a position where they easily could abuse or sell

the medication. Oxycodone has a huge street value. That's a pretty tight little income if you're selling that every day. There's just a lot of wrong things about it.

- Q. What would be the appropriate way -- if Mr. Young were actually practicing medicine, what would be the appropriate way to deal with this?
- A. So, you know, you want to say, oh, I just fired a patient. But you'd bring them in, you'd say, look, I know you're doing this. You obviously have a problem or you're selling it and you just need to come clean and tell me. Like, if you need help, if you're addicted to this stuff, we can do that, but you can't just keep going as you are as if nothing happened.
- Q. Would it be appropriate medical practice to engage in a sexual relationship with this patient?
 - A. No, ma'am.
- Q. What if you also hired this patient as your front desk employee; would that be appropriate way to deal with this?
 - A. No, ma'am.
- Q. Does the fact that -- would the fact -hypothetically, if Mr. Young had employed this Daphne
 Montoya, was engaged in a sexual relationship with her and
 was writing her prescriptions under two different names,
 would that make it better or worse?
 - A. That definitely makes it worse.

- Q. Okay. Generally -- and we can -- let me put that down. I have some just general questions about some patients that you may have looked at without, you know, slogging through the records. Did you review a record for a gentleman named Jay Green, who was a police officer listed on his intake form?
- A. Yes, ma'am. He had some kind of foot pain and maybe a fracture.
- Q. How would a fentanyl patch impact the ability of a police officer to do his job safely?
- A. A fentanyl patch would not be indicated to be used in anyone that had any kind of firearm and especially not for foot pain. It's completely inappropriate.
- Q. Did you find that -- did you form an opinion as to the prescriptions written for Jay Green?
- A. They were not written in the unusual course of medical practice for legitimate medical purpose.
 - Q. In the State of Tennessee?
 - A. In the State of Tennessee.
- Q. All right. And how about a patient, Tricia Stansell; do you remember reviewing her file?
 - A. I do.
- Q. Were there any prescriptions written to Tricia

 Stansell in the ordinary course of professional practice for a legitimate medical purpose in the State of Tennessee?

EXAMINATION OF TRICIA AULTMAN, M.D.

56

- 1 A. No, ma'am, there were not.
 - Q. How about Keith Moffit, were there any prescriptions written to Keith Moffit in that -- that meet the standard I just said?
 - A. No, ma'am.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- Q. And how about Bethany Pusser?
- A. No, ma'am.
 - Q. Not her either? How about Cyndal Story?
- A. No, ma'am. And she actually had all kind of stuff in her initial drug screen that when she was addressed about it, she actually laughed.
 - Q. She laughed?
 - A. She laughed.
- Q. And what would -- how would a practitioner, who was actually practicing medicine, deal with that?
- A. Again, you would bring them in and say, you obviously have a problem. I can help you, but you have to be honest.
- Q. Would you continue trying to -- would a practitioner continue trying to have sex with Cyndal Story under those circumstances?
 - A. Probably not, no.
- Q. All right. How about Amy Sanders?
- A. No, nothing was written for legitimate medical purpose in the usual course of professional practice in the State of Tennessee.

- Q. Okay. Now, I've asked you about specific -- some specific patients. We've gone through specific charts. Were these examples you identified, were they in this case one offs or did you see these patterns repeated throughout your review?
- A. The patterns were definitely repeated over and over and over, and I think I reviewed well over 20 charts.
- Q. And in those, were you able to see any examples to suggest that Jeffrey Young was prescribing opioids in the course of professional practice for the State of Tennessee?
- A. No, ma'am.
- MS. PAYERLE: Just one moment, please, if I could.
- 14 BY MS. PAYERLE:

- Q. Okay. Just one more quick series of questions: Sort of bad things sometimes happen in the personal lives of doctors like yourself?
- A. Yes, ma'am.
- Q. So they have people die and divorces and things that happen all the time, right?
 - A. Yes, ma'am.
- Q. When something bad happens to a medical professional that impacts their judgment or their ability to practice medicine, what are their obligations in the ordinary course of professional practice?

A. Their obligations are to get help. And I know in Tennessee and in most states, they have a method to get that. They don't want practitioners out there depressed, suicidal, you know, having alcohol problems. There's a method to get help that's relatively confidential.

In Tennessee, there's -- the Tennessee medical federation, I think, has a place you call and they set you up with a peer, and then everything that happens with that peer is private as long as they feel like you're still practicing safe medicine. And it's not reportable to medical boards, so you won't lose your license, all that kind of stuff. They've come a long way in those kind of accommodations for impaired physicians.

- Q. Hypothetically, if Mr. Young was, at the time of these prescriptions, going through something traumatic, like a divorce, does that somehow make any of these prescriptions legitimate?
 - A. No, ma'am.
 - Q. Okay.

MS. PAYERLE: All right. The Government passes the witness.

THE COURT: Thank you. Before we do cross, I think we'll go ahead and take a break. We've been going for about an hour-and-a-half or so. Okay.

MR. FERGUSON: I was going to ask, I need some

time to get the exhibits together too. 1 2 THE COURT: Okay. We're going to take an 3 afternoon break, ladies and gentlemen of the jury. You've 4 heard quite a bit more testimony. We'll pick this up in about 20 minutes or so. Okay. Leave your notebooks and 5 6 don't discuss. Don't discuss the testimony over the break. 7 (Jury out at 2:44 p.m.) 8 THE COURT: Okay. See everyone in about 20 9 minutes. 10 (A recess was taken from 2:45 p.m. to 3:15 p.m.) 11 THE COURT: Okay. Unless there's anything else, 12 are we ready? 13 MR. FERGUSON: We're ready. 14 THE COURT: Bring them in, please. 15 (Jury in at 3:15 p.m.) 16 THE COURT: Okay. Folks, I think we're ready to 17 push forward. So just have a seat. 18 I think it's time for cross, Mr. Ferguson? 19 MR. FERGUSON: Thank you, Your Honor. 20 CROSS-EXAMINATION 21 BY MR. FERGUSON: 22 Good to see you again. I'm going to pass forward some 23 documents to you and have you take a look at them. You 24 previously testified that you had reviewed Hope Rogers' 25 records?

EXAMINATION OF TRICIA AULTMAN, M.D.

THE COURT: Is that an exhibit?

MR. FERGUSON: It is not.

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

MR. FERGUSON: Your Honor, I ask that this be made the next exhibit. It's Hope Rogers' patient file.

THE COURT: Patient file, and that will be 101.

(Exhibit 101 marked and received.)

BY MR. FERGUSON:

- Q. I don't have much for you today. I'm going to try to be quick, but I hopefully will get through it pretty fast.
 - A. Okay.
- Q. Start off with a bad question. How much are you getting paid in this case?
- A. I've gotten paid, like, a lot of money, more than probably my parents could have ever imagined. I started doing this 20 years ago, and it was a way for me to make extra money while my kids were little. They were asleep, and almost never involved going to trial.
 - Q. Right.
- A. Most expert witnesses make about \$500 an hour. I used to charge less. One of the district attorneys a long time ago said you look cheap. You have to charge more to be kind of on par with the rest of them. And, undoubtedly, it's been insane the amount of money that I never thought I would be doing.

UNREDACTED TRANSCRIPT

- Q. Do you make more money serving as an expert witness than you do as a hospitalist?
 - A. Oh, definitely not.
 - Q. Definitely not?
 - A. No. No, no.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

15

18

19

- Q. In this case, you've already received about 44,000?
- A. I think over the course of seven years, it's probably about that.
- Q. And I think you're contracted up to about 110 or something?
- 11 A. Yeah, I don't think I'll get anywhere near that. They
 12 always way overestimate.
- Q. Okay. And to be fair, you're getting paid to be here today?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- 16 Q. You got paid to review these records?
- 17 A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. It's a job. It's a real job, and it's something that's -- it's perfectly legal to do that?
- 20 A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Okay. So just on this one case, you're over \$40,000?
- A. I'm taking your word for it. I would have to pull my
 tax records for the last seven years, but that's probably
 about right.
 - Q. Okay. Opioids are used to treat pain, correct?

EXAMINATION OF TRICIA AULTMAN, M.D.

1 A. Yes, sir.

look.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

23

- Q. I'm sorry. I talked over you, and I didn't get a bad
 - Opioids are used to treat pain?

I'll try it again.

- A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. And, typically, or almost all times, you have to have a prescription to get opioids?
 - A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. And in order to prescribe opioids, you have to be licensed by the state as a medical or healthcare professional?
- A. Yes.
- Q. And the states typically are the ones that are responsible for overseeing licensed medical providers within the state?
 - A. Right.
- Q. If a -- somebody from the Tennessee Board of Nursing, an investigator came in to speak to the jury, that would be typically the first line of the people who oversee nurses?
- A. Yes.
- Q. You -- I want to go -- really, I just want to talk a lot about Hope Rogers.
 - A. Okay.
- Q. There's some real issues here. Hope Rogers, there was prescribing of the hydrocodone and Xanax?

- A. It was hydrocodone and Xanax and oxycodone too.
- Q. Okay. And Xanax, you say, is really counter -- it's not what you want to be prescribing a pregnant woman?
- A. Right. In terms of pregnancy class, A, B, C, D, X, it's a D.
- Q. Okay. Tell me what those mean. I heard you saying that, but it never really -- never really told me what that meant.
- A. Right. Pregnancy Class A, there's no problems to take in humans. There's very few medicines in that class. Like, a few vitamins, thyroid medicine and stool softeners.
- Q. All right.

A. Class B is that there are no known problems I think in animal studies, so probably safe: Tylenol, prenatal vitamins, some blood pressure medicines.

And C is that there's probably some animal studies that shows that you shouldn't use them, and there's not good human data. And so C is where opioids fall.

And D is animal studies definitely show harm, and there's probably harm in human studies, and you really shouldn't use Class D.

Class X is, for example, like thalidomide and other medicines that are a hundred percent we know will cause something bad to happen to the infant.

Q. That last one you said, that was the one in the '50s,

'60s that caused babies to be born deformed?

- A. Exactly. It's the one that caused the limb malformations and shortened arms.
- Q. Unfortunately, growing up we would have referred to them as flipper babies. I mean, that's a horrible word. We don't say it --
 - A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. That was the awful --
 - A. Probably politically incorrect these days.
- Q. It is. There's a lot that is, but different generations.
- A. Yes.

- Q. So D is -- it has a real potential of being harmful, but it's not counter -- it's not just a flat out no. There has to be some medical reason, and there has to be a real serious review of the situation?
- A. Correct. There has to be a very serious indication that will show the benefit outweighs the risk. And in my research on benzodiazepines, there just isn't. And the one I read from the American College of Obstetrics and Gynecology, it says there's really no indication to use benzodiazepines in pregnancy.
 - Q. Which one has the black box warning?
- A. So the benzodiazepines, when used with opioids, has a black box warning.

- Q. And I've seen that. I don't know where it went to.

 It was around here somewhere. Let's tell the jury what that

 means. A black box warning is on the medication itself or on

 the paperwork you get with it. There is a literal black box,

 like, glaring at you that says: Warning, this could be a

 dangerous combination, you must take special care with it,

 and, please, if you can, find some other alternative?
- A. Right. So it's there for benzodiazepines and opioids in combination. And the black boxes are also on other kinds of medicines that can have significant side effects.
- Q. And the black box for the combination of opioids and benzodiazepines, specifically, states that the risk is called neonatal -- what's the babies born with?
- A. Well, the black box warning is not for neonatal abstinence syndrome. The black box warning is an overall warning for all opioids and benzos because of the risk of oversedation.
- Q. Have you read it in a while? Have you looked at in a while?
- A. The black box on those, probably sometime in the last couple of months, but not recently, no.
- Q. Do you remember it saying if you're going to take it in combination, you need to be, at least, prepared for that outcome, and have a high-risk OB on board?
 - A. There's definitely -- if you're taking opioids and

benzodiazepines, there definitely needs to be a high-risk obstetrician or they call them a maternal-fetal medicine onboard and ready, so that you see them before, and then when you deliver, they're aware of the situation and can handle the infant.

- Q. And that's, in your opinion, would be the only safe way to handle something like that -- not safe way. That's the only way you could handle that if it had to be done?
 - A. Handle what exactly?
- Q. If somebody had to be on both those drugs and was pregnant, under the -- your professional opinion and the black box warning, you must have neonatal or some specialist on board to take care of the baby during delivery?
- A. No. The appropriate thing to do would be for you to change them to Suboxone or methadone, or find someone that could, as well as have someone from maternal-fetal medicine see you while you're still pregnant.
- Q. Okay. But, again, the black box warning, it indicates if it's going to be done, if it had to be done, if it accidentally got done, however it got done, have a high-risk OB on board?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Do you have any opinion on what the maximum number of patients a day a healthcare provider should see?
 - A. So most of the studies I've read recently show that

the average healthcare provider sees, in primary care, is usually around 30. That depends. Internal medicine are going to be less because your patients are older and sicker. Family practice, you have those young kids that are easy, you know, the cough/cold kind of thing, so it might be a little bit more.

- Q. Sixty would not be within the range of what a normal healthcare provider should be seeing in a day?
 - A. Not independently, no, sir.
- Q. Okay. You would not be able to provide them the quality and level of care that would be necessary in order to meet the standard of care?
 - A. No.

- Q. And when we talk about the standard of care, have you ever testified in civil cases before, or is it just criminal cases?
- A. I have given a deposition in a civil case. It went to trial, and I was not needed.
- Q. Okay. And in that case, were you asked to also testify as to kind of the standard of care within that profession?
- A. Yes, it was a standard of care for hospital medicine, and I was with the defense of the physician.
- Q. Suboxone, tell me again what two drugs that was? You said two different things.

EXAMINATION OF TRICIA AULTMAN, M.D.

- A. So it's naloxone, which is Narcan, and buprenorphine, which is --
 - Q. Say that one again?
 - A. Buprenorphine.
 - Q. Spell it if you can.
- A. Spelling is not my forte, B-U-P-R-E-N-O-R-P-H-I-N-E.
 - Close?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Buprenorphine?
- A. Buprenorphine, yes, sir.
- 10 Q. Buprenorphine?
- 11 A. How about just Suboxone?

used for addiction treatment.

- 12 Q. Suboxone?
- 13 A. There you go.
- Q. I don't want to talk about the other drug. I just
 want to talk about that drug. Is that drug -- is it
 prescribed by itself at times?
 - A. It is prescribed. So buprenorphine was released to help with opioid addiction and withdrawal. The problem was that by itself it could still be injected and abused. So they added Narcan to it, and when they added Narcan to it, you could still use it, they call sublingually under your tongue, but you can't inject it any more. That was a way to make it abuse deterrent. But buprenorphine, yes, sir, is
 - Q. And is buprenorphine, if it's not Suboxone -- well, if

UNREDACTED TRANSCRIPT

- it is Suboxone, would it say buprenorphine and --
 - A. -- naloxone.

- Q. -- naloxone in the PMP, or would it just show the opioid?
 - A. No, I think it should say both on the PMP.
- Q. Okay. So if it's just by itself, then that's not Suboxone, that's just the opioid?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. Okay. You told the jury it's common for people to take other people's medications. You're not happy with that, but you agree that that's somewhat common within the field?
 - A. It unfortunately does happen. Shouldn't, but it does.
- Q. Husband takes wife's medicines, boyfriend, girlfriend.

 If you have access to it, you say, hey, let me try that back
 pain medication to see if it works for me?
 - A. I suppose it does happen, yes, sir.
- Q. Okay. The Government asked you a little bit about -or you were talking a little bit about why it's so important
 for doctors that are having problems, either personal or
 mental or drugs, to seek help. Why -- again, why is that?
- A. So the medical boards have learned through the years that just punishing people for their addiction, whether it's alcohol, drugs or mental health issues, it just doesn't work, right? You just take their license away, and what that does is scares people away from treatment. So it's much more

kinder, gentler medical board in general for all the states, and they want you to come to them and say, hey, I'm hurting, I need help. And they're able to do that without you losing your license or being affected.

- Q. It's a risk when somebody has one of those problems that they're going to make mistakes in their practice?
 - A. Yes, sir.

- Q. That they're going to overlook things that they normally wouldn't overlook?
- A. Yes, sir, I would imagine.
- Q. That practices are run into the ground every day by doctors who are mentally ill or have drug or alcohol problems?
- A. I think that's an overgeneralization, but I'm sure it happens. I don't know about every day.
 - Q. Okay. Fair enough. You've seen it happen before?
 - A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. Patients get hurt when it happens?
- A. Usually, yes, sir.
 - Q. I'm going to pass back up Exhibit 101 to you. I just want to ask you a couple of questions about it. Will you just turn to the last page you have in there. Let's make sure we have the same number of pages. At the very bottom, do you see -- it may not be on there. Just tell me if it is -- GX419281?

EXAMINATION OF TRICIA AULTMAN, M.D.

A. It's 282 on mine.

- Q. It is. I didn't turn the page over. So you're holding a 282-page document?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And the records kept within this clinic for Hope Rogers is almost 300 pages?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And if you go back to the beginning around page 3 or 4, there's an information sheet. It's the pink sheet. It asks about insurance, secondary insurance, the normal stuff that you'd expect to see in a patient's file.
- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And that would be normal within the realm of a clinic. You would expect to see this. You would expect to have a file, and you would expect to see this paperwork at the beginning?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. There at page 5, 6, there's authorization to disclose protected healthcare records or information?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Common to expect to see that in a file?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Flipping the page over a couple, there's -- they took copies of her insurance, took copies of her driver's license, again, all pretty standard within the field of medicine to

UNREDACTED TRANSCRIPT

put that in the record?

A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

- Q. And then it just starts going through. And you have your -- I guess these are called -- well, what would you call the forms at page 12 when it has the patient name and the date and date of birth at the top? Is that a -- well, what do you call it?
 - A. It's called a progress note.
- Q. Progress note. And there should be one of these for each time the patient comes in to visit with Mr. Young?
- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Again, pretty standard in the industry to keep up with your records like this?
 - A. Right.
 - Q. They're not the best records? They're not really thorough?
 - A. No.
- Q. And, again, that's your opinion?
- 19 A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. Now, flipping through to page 36, what is that?
- A. Page 36 is a CT scan of the head that was done of Hope Rogers on December 30, 2014.
- Q. And it was done at the regional hospital of Jackson.
- 24 That's what we call a referral; is that correct?
- Or let me back up. It was done at the regional

hospital of Jackson?

A. Yes.

- Q. Okay. And it's normal within the course of a medical practitioner, especially maybe family practitioner, that if they need testing done, if they want a CT done, they don't have a CT in the back office, do they?
 - A. Sometimes, but --
 - Q. Family nurse practitioner?
- A. Sometimes they do. Sometimes they have an MRI in the parking lot. But, normally, they go -- it's a financial -- it's a money-making industry, radiology.
 - Q. Millions of dollars to have one of those, isn't it?
- A. Yes, sir. But, normally, they just go down to the local hospital with a prescription or a faxed order.
- Q. Right. And so you're not surprised to see something like this in a healthcare record that they needed some CT scans done, so they sent them out to go get them done?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Let's go to -- let's go to 98. Do you have it?
- 20 A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. Okay. This is the one I think -- I think they asked you questions about this or ones similar to this. Now, this is -- the collection date is 4/13/2016, long after the birth of her child in August of 2015, and it's got two inconsistent tests that have been marked in yellow. And if I understand

correctly, your testimony was -- the warning there is that those are the metabolites. Had they consumed the pill, the body would have broken it down so you want to see the drug itself and the metabolite showing that it's in the body?

A. Yes, sir.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

23

24

25

- Q. Okay. So the two inconsistents for the metabolites is what causes you concern?
 - A. Right.
- Q. And you believe and it would be your professional opinion that a provider, if they see this, should take notice and take warning of this?
- A. Right. I don't know any other biologic way that it could happen that you would not have the metabolite in your system --
 - Q. Right.
- A. -- but it would be in your urine. And if you thought it was a lab error, you could just repeat it.
- Q. If Hope Rogers had testified that at some point after the birth of her baby, she began to sell her medication, would this be consistent with her selling her medication?
- 21 A. It would be, and then maybe holding one back for the test.
 - Q. And, again, it is in the records that you reviewed?
 - A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. And you see down here it appears that at some point

she was counseled or asked questions about this testing?

A. Yes, sir.

- Q. And she denied it. And the -- one of the recommendations from the toxicology lab was to recollect or retest the sample; is that correct?
 - A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. Any idea what that is right there?
- A. It's a list of dates. I don't know what he's trying to indicate, if it was previous drug tests or what.
- Q. Okay. And so witnessed by -- and these are two females, and this is a female patient. Would you -- if you had a concern that they were breaking pills off and spiking their urine, if you will, you would have maybe your female staff observe the next urine sample?

MS. PAYERLE: Objection, Your Honor. This is very speculative.

MR. FERGUSON: I'll rephrase.

BY MR. FERGUSON:

- Q. Is it normal, within the field of urine screens within the medical profession, that you don't let somebody go into the bathroom and pee alone because they can spike it? If you have concerns about that, you would ask for a witness sample?
- A. Sometimes you do have somebody witness the sample because they can spike the urine or bring in urine from home that's somebody else's, but it's not clear to me that they

witnessed her urinating or they witnessed her denying that she took the medicine.

- Q. All right. If you're concerned about fake pee results, fake testing, what's the protocol? What's the standard in the field?
- A. I mean, I think I would call them in on a surprise, say, like, not on their regular scheduled appointment. Call them in and say, hey, we need a sample today. And if they're taking their medicine as prescribed every day, then it would be positive for the medicine and the metabolites.
- Q. Would it also be within the standard of care to have the observed samples?
 - A. You could, yes, sir.
- Q. Okay. You say that you have great concern over the hydrocodone and the alprazolam, correct?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Can you explain to this jury why, I don't know, about three months before she gave birth, the hospital in Jackson was prescribing her hydrocodone along -- knowing that she was on Xanax?
- A. I can't explain that, no, sir. I know at one point she did have an admission for some preterm labor. I'm not sure if that correlated with the prescriptions you're talking about.
 - Q. I'm going to show you page 52 in that exhibit. It

says that Jackson medical admitted by her doctor, Armie Walker, given Demerol and hydrocodone. You were able to verify that, were you not?

- A. I read through the hospital medical records, and she was given those in the hospital, yes, sir.
- Q. And you also see it at page 183 -- wow, I'm so horrible these days -- 183. And, again, you can see that -- let me blow it up. Dr. Walker gives her 30 hydrocodone pills, which has a MED, is that the daily MED? What is that, MEE and MED?
- A. Yes, the morphine milligram equivalent or morphine equivalent dose.
- Q. He prescribes her 112.5 MEDs in the hospital while she's pregnant?
- A. That doesn't make sense to me because it looks like here she's getting hydrocodone 7.5 milligrams, a quantity of 30. It doesn't make sense that he wrote it for two days.

 Nobody is going to take 15 hydrocodone with that much Tylenol a day. So that's why the MED doesn't look right.
- Q. I agree with you. Nobody takes it -- takes that much in two days, do they?
 - A. No, sir. Well, they do, but it's not good.
- Q. No doctor is prescribing that much?
 - A. No, sir.
- Q. Okay. Thirty pills is probably more between 10 and 15

days, if she's taking two to three a day?

- A. I would think so.
- Q. Which would drop this down probably by half or more?
- A. Oh, way less. So if she took three a day, it would be
- 7.5 times three, I don't know, 20 something, 23, 24.
 - Q. Here's where she's taking, looks like, four a day.
- 7 | And it's only 30?

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- A. Thirty, yes, sir.
- Q. So -- but, again, her OB in the hospital is prescribing her the medication that you're saying is outside the normal scope and course of medical treatment?
- A. Right. I think the only caveat to her OB prescribing that is the situation surrounding her admission was preterm labor, and if he thought the benefit outweighed the risk of further labor. I can't really speak for him. I'm sorry.
 - Q. Right. All you can do is verify that Mr. Young wasn't the only medical professional prescribing her these drugs that you've just told the jury that no one prescribes?
- A. No, I said no one would prescribe benzodiazepines for sure. Opioids only in -- if you absolutely had to.
- Q. When you were reading over these records, did you read over the records of her high-risk OB?
 - A. Yes, sir, I did.
 - Q. So you were aware she had a high-risk OB?
 - A. She did, and it was a very thorough note.

Q. Why didn't you tell the jury she had a high-risk OB?

79

- A. Because she was on opioids and benzodiazepines, and the baby was at risk for neonatal abstinence syndrome.
 - Q. Right. But you didn't tell the jury that?
 - A. I don't know if we talked about it.
- Q. Did you tell the jury just a few minutes ago when the Government was asking you questions that she had received the same -- similar drugs from another doctor at the same time that you're testifying here today while you're getting paid against Mr. Young?
- A. Her OB only prescribed 30 hydrocodone one time and he -- the OB never prescribed benzodiazepines, so there's a difference between the duration and the medications that were given.
- Q. And in the records you reviewed, they knew she was on benzodiazepines?
 - A. They did.
- Q. So he prescribed hydrocodone knowing she was on Xanax, correct?
 - A. Yes.
- 21 Q. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Ferguson.

Any redirect?

MS. PAYERLE: Yes, Your Honor.

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. PAYERLE:

- Q. Dr. Aultman, can you think of a legitimate medical reason why a doctor may prescribe hydrocodone for a couple of days while a patient in preterm labor is in the hospital?
- A. Right. If you think whatever pain they're having —
 it wasn't clear to me from the records, because I don't think
 I have those records. I reviewed her hospital delivery
 records. I'm not sure if I actually knew why she was in the
 hospital. But if you thought that the benefit outweighed the
 risk for a brief period of time, opioids are probably
 indicated at that point. And I think it was also further
 along in the pregnancy, which makes it much less dangerous
 than the first trimester, which is the beginning of the
 pregnancy when all the organs are being formed.
- Q. So does the fact that a doctor may have prescribed Hope Rogers hydrocodone for a very short period of time while she was in the hospital for preterm labor change your opinion about whether Mr. Young's ongoing and increasing prescriptions of hydrocodone alongside Xanax were for a legitimate medical purpose and within the course of professional conduct?
 - A. It does not change my opinion.

MS. PAYERLE: Nothing further.

THE COURT: Thank you.

UNREDACTED TRANSCRIPT

1 Mr. Ferguson, anything further?

MR. FERGUSON: No, I don't think so. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. You're quick on the draw there, but you are excused. Thank you.

Government, if you would, please, call your next witness.

MS. PAYERLE: Your Honor, at this time the Government rests.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. I think you heard the Government rests its case as far as in chief is concerned. That alerts me that some issues I have to take up with the lawyers. It's going to take a little longer than us just going to side-bar like we've been doing. What that means is I'm going to have to send you to the jury room for a short time before we can proceed with the trial. Okay?

I'll take care of those things and get back to you just as quickly as possible. Leave the notebooks. Don't discuss, and I'm going to go ahead and excuse you to the jury room.

(Jury out at 3:46 p.m.)

THE COURT: All right. Are there any motions?

MR. FERGUSON: There are, Your Honor. It's going to take me just a moment to pull up the indictment. I want to have it in front of me when I walk through.

THE COURT: Do you need a few minutes?

UNREDACTED TRANSCRIPT

MR. FERGUSON: It just takes me about 30 seconds,

2 probably.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. FERGUSON: Yes, please. It's either that or

try to dig through all the paperwork to find it.

THE COURT: We're not in recess. Y'all can be seated.

MR. FERGUSON: Your Honor, if I may.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. FERGUSON: Thank you. On behalf of Jeffrey Young, at this time, defense makes a motion for judgment of acquittal on the indictment. There's some specific issues in which the Government's proof is lacking such that this case should not be -- should not move forward at this point.

Count 1, obviously, charges a conspiracy in this count. One of the key -- obviously, the number one feature of conspiracy is an agreement between two or more people to do something that's illegal. The case here, originally, while I understand it, says -- it doesn't say known or unknown. It just says that defendants Jeffrey Young, Alexander Alperovich and Andrew Rudin did knowingly and intentionally combine, conspire, confederate and agree -- here it is -- with each other and others unknown -- there it is. I knew it was in there somewhere -- to distribute Schedule II substances. I haven't heard any proof of

conspiracy or agreement among anyone. In fact --

THE COURT: Among what was it?

MR. FERGUSON: Among anyone.

THE COURT: Oh, anyone.

MR. FERGUSON: Of course, they always throw in the language known and unknown. It's always kind of wait to see who shows up to court to testify. Well, out of the three named people, Jeff Young didn't testify, nor is there any proof in any of his many statements that he had made some agreement with other people to sell or prescribe these drugs to the patients.

And that's one of the things we have to keep in mind here is that the patients are -- in the state's case, they're the target of this conspiracy. They're not the coconspirators. They're the target to sell them and to prescribe them the medication to addict them to keep them coming in so that other people can make money off the practice and that -- and in their words, the illegal drug sales.

Dr. Alperovich was very clear, and I was very specific to ask him was it -- was it your understanding -- was it your intent, your agreement -- did you two have an agreement to sell drugs, to prescribe drugs? And he said no.

There's been no testimony from Dr. Rudin. And there's been nobody who has come in and said that there was a

conspiracy.

Even when Kristie Gutgsell came in, she was asked had she pled guilty to something, and she said, yes, but she did not -- there was no questioning of her as to what the -- what the agreement was, if there was an agreement, was Mr. Young part of that agreement. Just that she had pled guilty and was awaiting sentencing.

So as far as the conspiracy goes, there's been no testimony to support a conspiracy in this case.

In the second through, I think it's Count 7, that is the dispensing to Hope Rogers and not for a legitimate medical purpose. The proof has been that she was a patient. She was being seen by him. He was treating her and prescribing her medication while at the office. There's no allegation that he was trying to sleep with her, and that's not part of Counts 2 through 7. The proof has been to this point and, again, through the Government's last witness that there were other physicians prescribing her hydrocodone.

And so if it's -- apparently, there are other physicians prescribing her the same medication that they're trying to say was somehow outside the normal scope and course of the medical professional within a medical setting, then I don't think that that's adequate proof to present Counts 2 through 7 to the jury.

Eight through 14, again, those are the two

undercover officers. So -- and in the indictment they have patient in quotes because they weren't patients. They were undercover officers. Again, the testimony has been they came into the office. They made complaints of pain. The prescriptions -- again, the experts testified that opioids are to treat pain. They complained of pain. They were given prescriptions for pain and that that would be consistent. It's been on video. It's, obviously, in his office. It's within the normal course and scope of his practice. He was licensed when he did it. He interviewed them.

While it might have been pathetically short and underwhelming by all accounts, it was still: What are you here for, what are your symptoms, what's helped you in the past, let's start and try this. There was testimony from Mr. Young through the nursing board that he was asked what do you do if it doesn't work. I can titrate up to twice. And I believe -- I think on both these cases, they were only titrated twice.

But, again, it's consistent with what he said that was his means and manner of treating pain within his clinic. And nothing in it indicates that, again, that the prescriptions were for anything outside the normal course and scope of his practice. If for some reason these officers — that's why we were very keyed in to ask them: Did he ask you for sex, did he try to have sex with you. Obviously, that

makes it a very -- it would be very damaging to us if that had been the outcome or that had been the -- his conversations with them. That would, obviously, be something the Government would be able to hang their hat on saying the reasoning for these prescriptions was for something other than to treat the complaint, that it was to bribe them, if you will, into sex. That's not what happened here. He had the -- there was nothing that indicated he was doing anything other than meeting with them, investigating their claims of pain and prescribing medication as he thought was appropriate.

Based on that, I think -- and, I guess, with all of those, naturally, 15 would fall, which is holding out a -- maintaining a drug involved premise and that just naturally would fall if the other falls. So I'd ask Your Honor to enter a judgment of acquittal on these cases.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Government, who will it be? Mr. Pennebaker?

MR. PENNEBAKER: Yes, Your Honor. Briefly.

The argument about the insufficient evidence of conspiracy in Count 1, starting with the three individuals that are named in the indictment, Ms. Gutgsell was -- I'm sorry. I'm just making sure I go back to the top of the indictment here. So you have a -- Dr. Alperovich testifying that he couldn't have done -- that Mr. Young couldn't have

done what he did without Dr. Alperovich supervising the practice. So that's evidence of a conspiracy with Dr. Alperovich that's sufficient at least to go to the jury as a disputed fact, a question of fact.

There are other individuals, Dr. Alston, one of the precepting physicians early on in the practice that

Ms. Gutgsell testified he oversaw the practice of the clinic.

He signed records. The records at that time as the

Government's expert testified were abysmal just like they

were the entire time. That's evidence of a conspiratorial

agreement between that precepting physician, who was getting

paid for precepting, and the defendant.

Dr. Rudin, the perfect preceptor that we had evidence on. There's conspiracy evidence in the record as far as that individual is concerned. And then, in addition, the Government's 800 series, there are indicia that Mr. Young is prescribing to some of these patients after determining, after finding out, after seeing red flags that they're selling their pills.

So, again, that goes beyond a patient/physician relationship and into a conspiring with someone else to facilitate the ultimate distribution of those drugs for purposes other than medical practice. So that's the Government's response to the motion to dismiss Count 1.

THE COURT: Before we go on to the other counts,

tell me again proof in the record with Dr. Rudin.

MR. PENNEBAKER: Dr. Rudin was the perfect preceptor that I believe Ms. Gutgsell testified. We saw some text messages between Mr. Young and Ms. Gutgsell where Ms. Gutgsell talks about how hard Dr. Rudin is to track down to get him to sign records, to get him to see -- you know, to perform his supervisory function in the practice. And Mr. Young responds to Ms. Gutgsell's frustration with the phrase "the perfect preceptor," which is an allusion to the fact that he's basically nonexistent, just covering, signing for the practice, allowing the defendant to continue to do his -- to do his diversion with drugs.

There was also testimony that Dr. Rudin was a friend, that he lived in Chicago, that he never came to the clinic, that he took a thousand dollars for covering for the practice, basically.

THE COURT: And so that supports the conspiracy agreement?

MR. PENNEBAKER: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead.

MR. PENNEBAKER: The arguments about the dispensing to Ms. Rogers, we've got specific opinions in the record from the Government on the issue of whether or not those prescriptions that are charged in the indictment were issued outside the scope of professional practice without a

legitimate medical purpose, and the expert concluded that, yes, each one of them was issued outside the scope. We've also got the patient testifying she didn't need those drugs. In addition to other evidence that suggested that it's outside the scope. There's a lot of it. So I won't go over it all, Your Honor.

Then the counts involving the undercover, I believe that the expert testified as to one of those prescriptions -- no, no, as to one of them that had the undercover actually taken the drugs, that she would have been killed. I think that's probably sufficient to meet the burden to show that the prescription there was outside the scope. The expert also opined that each one of those prescriptions was issued outside the scope.

The jury saw the consults and there's been testimony from Shirley Pickering, from the Government's expert, and even Mr. Young on the recordings of medical boards seems to acknowledge that these things were the scope of professional practice claiming that he did these things and contrast that with the video of the undercovers that showed, basically, that he did none of them. So all of that is evidence that supports a conviction on any of those counts.

Then the drug involved premises, the Government established through multiple witnesses that Mr. Young owned

and maintained that premises, that he was -- that he was paying the rent there. That Ms. Goslee, I know, testified that he was the owner and the operator. We even heard him say on the Rock Doc TV that -- you know, sort of saying, hey, this is my place. I'm the owner, president, et cetera, of PREVENTAGENIX.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Mr. Ferguson, anything further?

MR. FERGUSON: No, Your Honor. I've made my points. Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, my job in dealing with these motions, I have to determine whether a reasonable jury viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to the Government could find the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. I don't make any comments or anything about credibility, and I'm not really weighing the evidence. The real question is in the light most favorable to the Government, are there really jury issues; and my finding is that for all the counts, there are decisions that the jury is going to ultimately have to make.

As for the conspiracy, things Mr. Pennebaker makes with regard to Rudin are true. The testimony came in through the testimony. I can't remember her name, but she was the office manager that he was, as it turned out in the communications, was said to be the perfect preceptor. Never

showed up, little or no review of the records. That does support a conclusion of a -- an agreement between two or more people, Rudin and, of course, Mr. Young. Now, of course, the agreement doesn't have to be formal or written or anything like that, but it does indicate that relationship.

Also, Dr. Alperovich -- I'm probably mispronouncing that -- testified that they entered into an agreement, a written agreement, if I'm not mistaken. I know it wasn't introduced into evidence. He said early on he didn't think anything would be wrong with it; but y'all correct me if I'm wrong, he reviewed the documents the first time he went there. He saw that they were inadequate, bad. He should have stopped it at that time, but he did not.

So the jury will have to determine when the conspiracy came into being, but there are definitely facts, testimony from witnesses that indicate that there's an agreement to do this. And, of course, the defendant,

Mr. Young, couldn't do this without having the doctors' oversight, even though for some periods of time, he did. He used the stamp and continued to do it in those times when no doctor was available. But there are indications in the record — of course, the jury will ultimately make the decision that there is an agreement between the defendant and at least one other person to commit the crimes.

Counts 2 through 7, Rogers being pregnant at the

time, the last witness was unequivocal that the way the -Ms. Rogers was treated was definitely outside the course of
professional practice. The testimony about the scripts that
were given to Rogers specifically while she was pregnant, was
outside that scope, and it could lead to criminal
responsibility.

So, again, based upon the evidence and looking at it in the light most favorable to the Government, there are issues that the jury is going to ultimately make, and so the motion in that regard is also denied.

And, similarly, the undercover officers who testified, we saw the videos, scripts were given to them.

Again, the last witness indicated that reviewing all of that, again, the medical treatment and issuance of the prescriptions was outside that course of professional practice, at least for the State of Tennessee.

Again, the jury is just going to have to make the final decision. They viewed all the evidence, as I did, while it was coming in. And I -- but on all the counts -- and I agree with you, Mr. Ferguson, Count 15 rides with the other counts. And so the jury, in viewing all the evidence in the light most favorable, there are issues that the jury could return verdicts of guilty on. And so for those reasons, the motion is denied.

MR. FERGUSON: Your Honor, if I may. I just want

to make sure it's clear on the record. The agreement between my client and Dr. Alperovich that's been mentioned in this trial was the supervision agreement, the legal document detailing that there was a contractual relationship between the doctor to be the preceptor of Mr. Young.

THE COURT: Was that document introduced? I didn't think it was. Maybe I'm wrong.

MR. FERGUSON: I don't think it ever got in.

THE COURT: I know there was testimony about it, but I don't think anyone ever introduced it.

MR. FERGUSON: Well, I wasn't expecting it to be brought up in the motion of judgment for acquittal either.

That's the agreement was a preceptor agreement. Clearly, there wasn't a written agreement to distribute Schedule II drugs.

THE COURT: Right. I didn't think it was an agreement to distribute the drugs, but there was an agreement between the two. It started, at least, with that document; but I also focus in when the doctor went there that first time, saw the charts, the records. And I think he said he should have put a stop to it at that time, or at least talked with your client about it but chose not to. That was the worst decision, of course, he said in his life, and it cost him. That all, taken together, indicates an agreement to -- you know, to issue these scripts as the way they were.

EXAMINATION OF TRICIA AULTMAN, M.D.

MR. FERGUSON: I was just -- I didn't want there to be any argument that there was a written agreement to be distributing Schedule II drugs illegally.

THE COURT: No. No. But there was testimony about an agreement that they both -- a written agreement that they entered into.

MR. FERGUSON: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm assuming, Mr. Ferguson, no change, there will be no proof from the defense?

MR. FERGUSON: That's correct, Your Honor. I thank you for the time to review it further with my client.

THE COURT: Yeah, we need to put it on the record.

MR. FERGUSON: Do you want him to be on the stand?

THE COURT: Yes, please. Have him come up, if you would, please. And before you get there, I need to place you under oath. So if you would, please, raise your right hand.

1 <u>JEFFREY W. YOUNG, JR.</u>,

called on behalf of the Defense, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. FERGUSON:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Would you please state and spell your name for the record.
 - A. Jeffrey Walter Young, Jr., J-E-F-F-R-E-Y.
 - O. Y-O-U-N-G?
- A. Y-O-U-N-G.
- Q. Mr. Young, how long have I been representing you on this case?
- 13 A. Since 2017.
 - Q. And since this is, I think, a 2019 indictment, that means that I was also representing you in front of the Tennessee Nursing Board on these matters?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. And we've had multiple hearings or multiple negotiations and ongoing litigation with the nursing board. You've been arrested on this case. We had lengthy bond hearings that lasted over multiple days. There's thousands, tens of thousands of records. You've sat through your trial; and at this point, as we've discussed with you, this is where we make a decision whether or not you testify.

That decision has to be made by you. Only you can

EXAMINATION OF JEFFREY W. YOUNG, JR.

make that decision. No one else can make that decision for you. Do you understand all of that?

- A. I understand.
- Q. We've talked about it as of late. Just a few minutes ago, we sat with you again and discussed it?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. And we answered your questions?
- A. Correct.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

13

14

15

17

18

- O. We discussed the evidence?
- 10 A. Correct.
- 11 Q. We went over the risks and benefits of you testifying?
- 12 A. Correct.
 - Q. Even up to the point at the beginning of trial in voir dire, I spoke to the jury about the possibility of you not testifying?
- 16 A. Correct.
 - Q. Or the possibility of you testifying, correct?
 - A. Correct.
- 19 Q. All right. You understand if you decide to testify,
- 20 this Court will instruct the jury to treat your testimony
- 21 like any other witness?
- 22 A. Correct.
- Q. You also understand that one of the risks is that the
 Government gets to cross-examine you and there's -- at times
- 25 it can be very dangerous opening the door to other facts or

evidence coming in that have not yet been presented as evidence?

A. Correct.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

17

18

19

20

21

22

- Q. And based on your understanding of the situation and the facts and evidence, the counsel that Mr. Damas and I have given you, have you made a decision of whether or not you wish to testify?
 - A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. What is your decision?
- A. I'm choosing not to testify.
- Q. Is that your own decision?
- 12 A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. Freely and voluntarily made?
- 14 A. Yes, sir.
- 15 Q. No threats or pressure?
- 16 A. Not at all.
 - Q. All right. What that means is we're going to sit down. The jury will be brought back in. The judge will ask me if the defense wishes to put on any proof. I'll stand up and say we elect not to put on any proof. Rest our case.

 And after that, the case is over for all practical purposes.
 - A. Correct.
- 23 Q. Okay.
- MR. FERGUSON: That's all I have, Your Honor.
- 25 THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

EXAMINATION OF JEFFREY W. YOUNG, JR.

Mr. Young, I just want to focus in on the last thing. This is your decision that you're making; is that right?

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Of course, you've heard all the testimony, and you're probably the most familiar with this whole case than anyone else. You understand the case from beginning to end, and you've discussed it thoroughly with Mr. Ferguson, both your lawyers, actually?

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: I didn't realize that he was with you even before the indictment was returned.

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Both he and you are very familiar with everything that happened in this case?

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. As I think you know, it can't be his decision. It can't be a decision where, well, my lawyer told me not to testify, and if I found out X, Y, Z, I would have testified. That's why I spend so much time with you and Mr. Ferguson spent time with you, that you are fully familiar with everything that happened in this case. Is that right?

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. And you've discussed it

UNREDACTED TRANSCRIPT

EXAMINATION OF JEFFREY W. YOUNG, JR. 99 1 thoroughly. But whose decision is this? 2 THE WITNESS: This is mine. 3 THE COURT: Okay. No threats, no pressure? THE WITNESS: Mine and mine alone. 4 5 THE COURT: Okay. Your own free will? 6 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. 7 THE COURT: And you're comfortable with your 8 decision? 9 THE WITNESS: I am. 10 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. You can step 11 down. 12 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 13 THE COURT: Thank you. 14 Okay. I'm going to bring the jury in. And as 15 you said, I'm going to turn to you and ask if there's any 16 proof. Of course, you'll rest in front of them. I'll excuse them for the evening, and then I'd like to talk for a short 17 18 time on jury instructions. 19 MR. FERGUSON: Yes, Your Honor. 20 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Bring them in, 21 please. 22 (Jury in at 4:13 p.m.) 23 THE COURT: All right. Folks, I worked through 24 all those issues that I spoke about, and I think when y'all 25 stepped out, the Government had rested its case. So we're

going to turn to the defense now.

Mr. Ferguson?

MR. FERGUSON: Your Honor, and ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of Jeffrey Young, we elect not to put on any proof. We rest.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Ferguson.

That being said, that means that you've heard all the proof that you're going to hear in the case. For you, the next step is going to be the closing arguments and then final instructions that I will give you. But because the defense rests, that means there are more issues that I have to take up with the lawyers, and I have to do that outside of your presence. I'm not going to make you sit back there in the jury room for another hour, hour and a half while we're in here arguing. So what I mean is I'm going to go ahead and excuse you for the day.

We'll still be here working. There are several things we need to take care of in order to prepare for tomorrow. I'd like you back in the jury room and ready to go at 9:30 tomorrow morning. We're going to get together at nine o'clock to deal with any final issues, but at 9:30 is when we'll pick this up. And as I said, it will be the closing arguments and statements of the lawyers. Okay.

All right. Yes, sir?

JUROR: Closing arguments, that's when you're

going to give us, like, the instructions as far as --

THE COURT: Yes. The way it will work is they will give their arguments, and then after all that is done, I'll give you the written instructions that will apply to this case. One of the things we'll be dealing with is I'll be going over the instructions with the lawyers. They know what I'm going to instruct. Okay. And sometimes they even -- because they know it and have a copy of the instructions, sometimes they use the language that I am going to give to you as part of their arguments. So that's one of the things we'll be dealing with this evening and sometime tomorrow morning.

But when you come back, it will be the arguments, and then it's another time when I have to read those instructions to you. You'll have those in the back when you deliberate. Okay.

All right. Leave your notebooks in the chair again. Remember the rules this evening. Don't discuss; local news, you know, things like that; no independent investigations. And I'll see y'all at 9:30 tomorrow.

(Jury out at 4:15 p.m.)

THE COURT: In just a moment we'll take a recess.

I've kind of been tinkering with the instructions as the

trial has proceeded. I know I get a little antsy about how

long it takes to put on witnesses, but we finished the proof

a lot faster than I thought we would. I guess I'll put it like that. So you see a smiling judge up here. But I'll check and see. Like I say, my clerk has been working on the instructions. What I normally do is have a hard copy for each of the lawyers, give you an opportunity to read them.

Inquiry, y'all discussed the instructions before, or have you? I don't know.

MS. PAYERLE: Did we discuss them back in October? I don't remember. I don't know that we have in this setting yet.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. FERGUSON: If we did, I don't remember it.

THE COURT: All right. Well, I used -- I think yours was shorter. You were more interested in intent.

MR. FERGUSON: Yes, I had only submitted something in regards to the good-faith defense and the ruling, instruction --

THE COURT: Right. You'll see all that in there. I used -- as far as elements of the offense, I used a lot of that from the Government's submission but we'll see. I want y'all to take a look at the adequacy. Of course, both sides have an opportunity to discuss with me, you know, deletions, additions, anything like that. So, hopefully, I have a hard copy for you, hopefully, in about 15 minutes or so.

MR. FERGUSON: Yes, sir.

1 THE COURT: All right. We'll be in recess. 2 (A recess was taken from 4:17 p.m. to 5:35 p.m.) 3 THE COURT: Okay. I think one of my folks 4 brought out a draft of the instructions for everyone to 5 So why don't we just go ahead and get to it. I'll 6 ask both sides if they have a request for, you know, 7 admissions, deletions, things like that. 8 We'll start with the Government. 9 MR. PENNEBAKER: Your Honor, just a few things. 10 THE COURT: Sure. 11 MR. PENNEBAKER: And if it's okay, I'll just go 12 page by page with it. 13 THE COURT: That works. 14 MR. PENNEBAKER: This is a -- for page 8, 15 testimony of an accomplice. 16 THE COURT: Okay. 17 MR. PENNEBAKER: I've got the language tinkered 18 with, if the Court wants my edits, or I can just convey to 19 the Court that we think that Kristie Gutgsell ought to be in 20 there as well as Dr. Alperovich in the accomplice 21 instruction, just because the -- all the stuff about entering 22 into a cooperation agreement with the Government and enter 23 pleas to lesser charges. 24 THE COURT: Did she testify to all of that? 25 MR. PENNEBAKER: Yes, Your Honor.

104 1 THE COURT: A cooperation agreement and all? 2 MR. PENNEBAKER: Yes, Your Honor. 3 MS. PAYERLE: It was in the middle of her 4 testimony, but she did. 5 THE COURT: And her guilty plea, I'm assuming, 6 was related to this? 7 MR. PENNEBAKER: Yes, Your Honor. 8 THE COURT: It must have been state charges; is 9 that right? 10 MR. PENNEBAKER: No. It was actually she pled to 11 an information in Judge Breen's --12 THE COURT: It was Judge Breen who handled it 13 before. 14 MR. PENNEBAKER: Yes. 15 MS. PAYERLE: She pled quilty to aiding and 16 abetting Mr. Young's distributions to, I believe, two 17 specific patients that she testified about in this case. 18 THE COURT: Her testimony, it was brief, but I 19 didn't know all that. 20 MS. PAYERLE: Kristie Gutgsell. She was the long 21 witness on the first day, the second witness in the case. 22 THE COURT: I remember her. 23 MS. PAYERLE: Oh, you do? Sorry. 24 THE COURT: But I was unaware that she pled

UNREDACTED TRANSCRIPT

quilty to an information in federal court. Yeah, we'll

25

include her in the accomplice, and I'll adjust the language accordingly.

MR. PENNEBAKER: Sounds good, Judge. Thank you.

THE COURT: Hold on just a second. Okay. Go

ahead.

MR. PENNEBAKER: On page 10, Your Honor, there is an instruction for statement by defendant.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. PENNEBAKER: The -- I believe that the statement by the defendant rule about not being able to convict solely upon an uncorroborated statement or admission really goes toward confessions, and I have spoke with defense counsel about this. We both think that it would be fair to say that the nursing board interview -- and I think that's really what this instruction is getting at is the statement made during the nursing board interview. That does cross the line into a Crawford statement. The Government would agree with that. But the -- some of the surreptitious recordings like the undercover video, some of the text messages that really aren't testimonial, we would say would not fall within --

THE COURT: I didn't think they would. Are you asking me to just take this out?

MR. PENNEBAKER: Your Honor, we're just asking that we maybe add after the defendant made statements in that

first line, so you heard evidence that the defendant made 1 2 statements. I would -- we would suggest adding to the 3 nursing board during interviews conducted by that agency. 4 And then --5 THE COURT: Nursing board . . . 6 MR. PENNEBAKER: -- during interviews conducted 7 by that agency. 8 THE COURT: Okay. 9 MR. PENNEBAKER: And then the last -- the second 10 paragraph, last sentence, it ends, statement or admission. 11 And we would suggest: Adding to the nursing board. 12 THE COURT: That last sentence, is that what 13 you're talking about? 14 MR. PENNEBAKER: Yes, Your Honor: You may not 15 convict the defendant solely upon his own uncorroborated 16 statement or admission to the nursing board. 17 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Go ahead. 18 MR. PENNEBAKER: I'll go out on a limb, Judge, 19 and say that, just for --20 THE COURT: Excuse me, before I do that, I should 21 Mr. Ferguson, are you in agreement to that? 22 MR. FERGUSON: I am. 23 THE COURT: Okay, I interrupted you. Go ahead. 24 MR. PENNEBAKER: Just for the sake of expediency, 25 I don't believe that identification is contested, and so we

```
107
     would just have that --
 1
 2
                 THE COURT: I always put identification.
 3
                 MR. PENNEBAKER: That's all I needed to hear,
 4
     Judge.
 5
                 THE COURT:
                            Okay.
 6
                 MR. PENNEBAKER: Understood.
 7
                 And then on page 18, Your Honor --
 8
                 THE COURT: Okay.
 9
                 MR. PENNEBAKER: -- about four lines from the
10
    bottom, it starts: Field in which . . .
11
                 THE COURT: Okay.
12
                 MR. PENNEBAKER: We would suggest -- the
13
    Government would suggest adding: State and field, like
14
     capital S State.
15
                 THE COURT: Instead of field, put in the state?
16
                 MR. PENNEBAKER: We would suggest just adding the
17
    State of Tennessee and the field in which . . .
18
                 THE COURT: Okay. Standards in the State of
19
    Tennessee?
20
                 MR. PENNEBAKER: Yes, Your Honor.
21
                 THE COURT: The world "field," leave it in there?
22
                 MR. PENNEBAKER: And field -- the State of
23
     Tennessee and field in which, because it's the, you know,
24
    family practice.
25
                 THE COURT: Okay.
```

108 1 MR. PENNEBAKER: And then a similar edit of 19, 2 Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Okay. 4 MR. PENNEBAKER: Usual course of professional 5 practice instruction. 6 THE COURT: Okay. 7 MR. PENNEBAKER: After -- on the fifth line down, 8 after substances --9 Okay. THE COURT: 10 MR. PENNEBAKER: Just to add: In the State of 11 Tennessee. 12 THE COURT: Substances in the State of Tennessee? 13 MR. PENNEBAKER: Yes, Your Honor. 14 THE COURT: Describing controlled substances. 15 Okay. Go ahead. 16 MR. PENNEBAKER: On page 20, under the good-faith instruction. 17 18 THE COURT: Okay. 19 MR. PENNEBAKER: About halfway through, there's 20 the word "recognize" on the left-hand side of the page. 21 THE COURT: I see it. 22 MR. PENNEBAKER: And accepted in the -- and then 23 instead of country, the State of Tennessee. 24 THE COURT: Okay. No problem. 25 MR. PENNEBAKER: And then three lines down on the

UNREDACTED TRANSCRIPT

far left, there's another instance of country. 1 2 THE COURT: You know, in one of my drafts, I took 3 that out. 4 MR. PENNEBAKER: We understand. This is the 5 story of our life, Your Honor. It's something in the water. 6 THE COURT: Yeah, I worked last night and did all 7 this and deleted it, and I think that was one of the 8 things -- anyway, go ahead. 9 MR. PENNEBAKER: There is -- this is 10 inconsequential utterly, but at the end of that instruction, 11 there's an errant quotation, last line right before 12 deliberate ignorance, unauthorized manner, end quote. 13 There's no open. 14 THE COURT: Oh, yeah, there's no open quote. 15 We'll just strike out that quote mark there. 16 MR. PENNEBAKER: Yes, Your Honor. 17 THE COURT: That's a gremlin. 18 MR. PENNEBAKER: This one, I think is important. 19 On page 22 . . . 20 THE COURT: Go ahead. 21 MR. PENNEBAKER: We have at the top, the third 22 element has that the defendant knowingly and intentionally 23 distributed outside the scope. But then on Count 8 to 14, 24 the third element does not contain knowingly and 25 intentionally, and we believe that it should.

1 THE COURT: Oh, okay. Yes, it should. That's on 2 oversight. So at the bottom of page 22 at No. 3, that the 3 defendant knowingly and intentionally distributed. 4 MR. PENNEBAKER: Yes, Your Honor. 5 THE COURT: Go ahead. 6 MR. PENNEBAKER: And then, Judge, on page 26. 7 THE COURT: All right. 8 MR. PENNEBAKER: We're at the verdict form. 9 THE COURT: Okay. 10 MR. PENNEBAKER: The substantive Counts 2 through 11 14 are charged in the indictment as on or about counts. And 12 we would ask that --THE COURT: "For about" be added? 13 14 MR. PENNEBAKER: "For about" be added to those. 15 THE COURT: Okay. 16 MR. PENNEBAKER: The only other thing, and it's 17 on page 26, is that I believe there is an extra one before 18 the five in March 15. It's charged in the indictment as March 5. 19 THE COURT: That should be March 5 rather than 20 21 15? 22 MR. PENNEBAKER: Yes, Your Honor. 23 THE COURT: Okay. And that's in Count 2. 24 MR. PENNEBAKER: And that's all we have. 25 THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

UNREDACTED TRANSCRIPT

1 MR. PENNEBAKER: Thank you. 2 THE COURT: Mr. Ferguson? 3 MR. FERGUSON: Your Honor, at the bottom of 20. 4 THE COURT: Hold on just a second. 5 The good-faith instruction. MR. FERGUSON: 6 THE COURT: Yes. Just a second. Okay. Go 7 ahead. 8 MR. FERGUSON: Right after the quotation mark 9 that shouldn't be there, we would ask that the Court add: 10 Negligent or recklessness is not sufficient to convict. 11 However, I do -- generally would say that on page 17, the 12 definition of knowing, willfully and intentionally is defined 1.3 and means voluntarily and not because of mistake and 14 accident. Of course, mistake and accident are reckless and 15 negligent. So it is defined basically on page 17. I just 16 ask that that be added to make it more clear in the 17 good-faith instruction. 18 THE COURT: Do y'all have any problem with that? 19 MR. PENNEBAKER: Judge, if we didn't have a 20 deliberate ignorance instruction in there, we might be a 21 little testy about reckless, but given that we do, no 22 objection. 23 Just give me the language one THE COURT: Okay. more time so I make sure we get it. 24 25 MR. FERGUSON: Right where that parentheses is,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

112

negligent or recklessness is not sufficient to convict or however -- I guess, would be -- it wouldn't be however. Just negligence and recklessness is not sufficient to convict. THE COURT: And that will go right after the unauthorized manner. MR. FERGUSON: Yes, please. THE COURT: Okay. Okay. I'll make that addition. MR. FERGUSON: Thank you, Judge. MR. PENNEBAKER: If we -- just talking with my cocounsel, if we could have this evening and -- just to reserve maybe a little bit of additional argument. We would like to look at the case law on recklessness just to make sure that we're not doing something by agreeing to --THE COURT: That's why I'm bringing y'all back tomorrow morning before the jury. MR. PENNEBAKER: Thank you, Judge. THE COURT: That's what always happens overnight. You don't have anything else to do, so you start looking at the instructions. You know, y'all be here at nine, jurors at 9:30. Okay? MR. PENNEBAKER: Thank you, Your Honor. MR. FERGUSON: Nine o'clock? THE COURT: Yeah, y'all will be here at nine, and

UNREDACTED TRANSCRIPT

the jurors will be here at 9:30.

MR. FERGUSON: Okay. THE COURT: Anything else, Mr. Ferguson? MR. FERGUSON: No, Your Honor. Thank you. THE COURT: Okay. MR. PENNEBAKER: No. THE COURT: All right. Well, I think we're done for the evening. I'll make these changes. We'll have final discussion tomorrow morning before we begin the arguments. Unless there's anything else? Okay. Let's go ahead and adjourn for the evening. (Adjournment.)

CERTIFICATE I, TINA DuBOSE GIBSON, do hereby certify that the foregoing 113 pages are, to the best of my knowledge, skill and abilities, a true and accurate transcript from my stenotype notes of the trial hearing held on the 30th day of March, 2023, in the matter of: UNITED STATES OF AMERICA VS. JEFFREY W. YOUNG, JR. Dated this 31st day of March, 2023. S/Tina DuBose Gibson TINA DUBOSE GIBSON, RPR Official Court Reporter United States District Court Western District of Tennessee

UNREDACTED TRANSCRIPT